nbn:de:hebis:30-180015199008

NATIONALISM

A Cause of Anti-Semitism

NATIONALISM
A Cause of Anti-Semitism

BY

SAMUEL BLITZ, M.A.

NEW YORK
BLOCH PUBLISHING CO.
"The Jewish Book Concern"
1928

Jud.
5199

COPYRIGHT, 1928,
BY
SAMUEL BLITZ

STADTBIBLIOTHEK
FRANKFURT AM MAIN

52/172 x2

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION vii

CHAPTER I

The Jews in Ancient Times 1

CHAPTER II

The Jews During the Rise of Christianity . . 6

CHAPTER III

The Jews In The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries 14

CHAPTER IV

The Jews in the Nineteenth Century 21

Germany 21

Russia 40

Poland 65

Balkania 77

France 85

Great Britain 90

CHAPTER V

The Jews Since 1914 94

Russia 97

Poland 116

Other Central European States 128

France, Great Britain and America 135

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion 143

APPENDIX I 150

APPENDIX II 153

INTRODUCTION

The history of anti-Semitism is as old as the history of the Jews. Where Jews have lived, anti-Semitism has existed in varying degrees of intensity. There has been an increased anti-Semitic activity since the World War. In Germany, Roumania and many of the new states, anti-Semitism has become so marked that it has aroused comment over the world. Even such liberal countries as the United States, Great Britain, and France have witnessed an increased anti-Semitic activity.

Anti-Semitism has been ascribed to many causes. Historians have generally agreed that the greatest cause of Jew-hatred until the nineteenth century had been religion. An increasing number of historians are placing greater emphasis on social, economic, and political conditions as the causes of anti-Semitism. Pseudo-scientists point out that anti-Semitism is the result of the clash of the culture of an inferior racial stock with the culture of a superior racial stock. The most important cause—Nationalism—has been quite generally ignored.

Nationalism is the attempt of a group, which possesses political structure or relationship to some present or past political structure, to impose its group-mind upon any group with which it comes into contact. It is necessary, however, to understand the nature of the

group-mind in order to understand its expression as nationalistic activity. An adequate definition of group-mind is well-nigh impossible. Generally, however, a group-mind is the mental bond which causes a number of individuals to look upon themselves as possessing a relationship which is peculiar to themselves and which makes them desirous of retaining that relationship. That mental bond is manifold in its characteristics. It is not merely economic in structure. The economic policies of the English and French might be identical, assuming that to be possible, yet no sufficient mental bond exists between them to weld them into one people. Catholicism, though common to the French and the Southern Germans, does not constitute a sufficient mental bond to draw them together. A mental bond cannot be based on occupational, geographical or linguistic similarity alone, nor on similarity of political structure. It is, rather, based on the historic growth of a group of individuals in which some or all of these factors play an interacting part.

The individual in the group plays a dual role. He is an individualist insofar as he differs from all other individuals in the group. His contacts, though they be similar or identical with the contacts of other individuals, affect him differently. His likes and dislikes are peculiar to himself. In the group, though, his individualism merges with the individualism of the others. Unconsciously, he is being affected by the others. There is a growing relationship between him and other members of the group. In pursuance of his daily work he

does not give a thought to this relationship. Alone, he does not know why it is best to be a German or an Englishman. His life is similar to that of any individual of the same relative social strata of any other group. He is a social animal and is tolerant or indifferent towards ideas or things which do not affect him. But, as soon as he suffers some discomfort, he becomes intolerant. When that discomfort is shared by the others of the group—whether it be the result of flag-waving or emotional stress—he becomes aware of the fact that he is a German or an Englishman. Then, he knows that his government is the finest and his tradition the greatest. He points with pride at the age-hallowed heroes of the group, though he does not know his family tree back three generations. He points out the richness, the beauty of his "Niebelungenlied" though, as an individual, he finds greater joy in the "Iliad." He now knows that it is best to be a German or an Englishman; that he is a member of the best group.

However, he really knows little or nothing. He is merely expressing an unconscious fear—not irrational—of a strange group. His adaptation to his group affords such security and comfort as cannot be had in any other. His adaptation has colored his mental processes. His existence is more or less of a stereotype. He sees life as the other members of the group see it. Life among individuals, who speak the same language, possess occupational similarities, dress similarly, worship the same heroes, receive religious comfort in a

similar way, even possess "dishes" peculiar to themselves, and so on, must be less resistant than among individuals who have adapted themselves to a strange set of conditions. Any real or imagined danger, whether it emanate from the professor or come from the enemy cruiser, is a rational cause for fear that greater resistance might attach to life.

It is the interaction of the various factors, above mentioned, upon the mental processes of the individuals, producing a stereotype, which constitutes a mental bond. It is the unconscious merging of the individualism of the individuals which constitutes a group-mind.

The individual must live according to set regulations. His freedom to order his life as he sees fit is dependent upon his ability to live harmoniously with other members of the group. He cannot kill or steal and retain his freedom. He cannot force another member to believe as he does. He cannot superimpose his intelligence upon the intelligence of another member of the group. Law, morals, and fear of God constitute a higher intelligence than his and check upon his activity.

This is not so with the collective individual, the group. It has but one mind, the product of the various minds of the members of the group; the result of the relationship between the members of the group. This group-mind has but one purpose: the retention of the group-relationship, of group-existence. This purpose is above law. It is unmoral, unethical, and unfearing. The retention of the group-relationship is a law unto

itself. Everything which constitutes potential danger to the group must be dealt with in no uncertain terms. Thus, murder, rapine, and arson are committed by groups. "There are a number of primitive hordes to whom every stranger not a member of the horde is an enemy and where it is right to damage the enemy to the best of one's power and ability and if possible to kill him. This custom is based largely on the idea of the solidarity of the horde to destroy all possible enemies. The feeling of the fellowship in the horde corresponds to the feeling of unity in the tribe, to a recognition of bonds, established by a neighborhood of habitat and further on to the feeling of fellowship among members of nation."[1] "He who is not with me is against me,"[2] said Jesus for the religious group. Although we have progressed from the horde to a civilized state, the mind of the group is essentially the same. Every group believes itself to be the one proper group. Everything that seems foreign is inferior and undesirable. Thus Christians consider Mohammedans as being infidels and non-believers and vice versa. Russian is gibberish and an inferior language to the American and Frenchman.

The very fact that groups exist necessarily implies dissimilarity of ideas, customs, and tradition. Without dissimilarity there would be no groups—all would exist in one large group. Since the existence of groups implies differences, it follows that, due to the nature of

[1] Boas Franz, *Mind of Primitive Man*, p. 207.
[2] *Matthew*, 12:30.

man, those differences must result in conflict when the groups come into contact with each other.

The purpose of the group, as has been pointed out, is to perpetuate itself; to retain that particular relationship which is desired by the members of the group. That relationship is, as has also been pointed out, dependent upon various interacting factors which result in the group-mind. Contact with other groups necessarily brings into bold relief the peculiarities of those groups. It also results in the interchange of ideas and customs. Group-solidarity is thus weakened in proportion to the divergent influence of strangers, resulting in a relationship between the individuals which does not conform with that which is held by the group-mind to be the desired relationship. In order to perpetuate itself then, the group must seek to counteract any influence which might tend to weaken it. It must possess an organic body and strength sufficient enough to do this. Expansion, to supply the needs of natural growth, economic and political activity, are historically necessary to enhance the strength of the group. It need not necessarily be in the form of conquest. It may be in the form of political intrigue, and economic enterprise, in the introduction of the group-mind into other lands through colonization, and, not of least importance, in the suppression of minorities within the group. In short, the group must impose its ideas and customs, its conception of a desirable relationship, *by whatever means,* upon any group with which it comes into contact. This is *Nationalism.*

Though Nationalism is, theoretically, the attempt of a national group to impose its consciousness, its psychology, upon another national group, it is in practice the attempt of any group, which possesses political structure or relationship to some present or past political structure, to impose its group-mind, consciousness, or psychology upon any group with which it comes into contact. Thus the German state might be nationalistic in its contact with the Russian state; the Austrian state in its contact with Italian Irridentists; the German colonies in South America in their contact with lesser influential groups; the pre-war Poles in their contact with the Jews. Nationalism transcends boundaries. It may be the attempt of an international church-state to impose its consciousness upon the various national or racial groups falling under its influence.

For a proper understanding of the following it is desirable that Nationalism in its practical application be borne in mind.

NATIONALISM

A Cause of Anti-Semitism

CHAPTER I

THE JEWS IN ANCIENT TIMES

When the Jews possessed a state of their own, any animosity which was shown them by their neighbors could not have been, basically, religious. The Jewish religion was polytheistic as was that of the neighboring states. When the Jewish tribes entered Palestine (somewhere before 1200 B. C.)[1] we find them worshipping various agricultural idols, many of which were adopted with the knowledge of agriculture gained from the Canaanites. When the Jews were being threatened by the Babylonians, Assyrians, and other peoples, the weakness with which they withstood the attacks of their neighbors was attributed to their internal condition. The Jews had long intermingled with their neighbors and had taken from them some of their customs and beliefs, thus violating the principle of unity. The social order of rich and poor, of employer and employee, with its attendant evils, further aided the corruption of the Jewish state. This milieu produced such reformers as Amos and Isaiah. Amos blamed much of the corruption on the intermingling with other tribes and attributed many ills of the social order to the worship of foreign gods. Isaiah preached against the oppression of the poor. Both held that the

[1] Moore, G. F., *History of Religions*, 1 Preface, VI.

Jews should do away with the great number of gods and worship Yahweh, who was their traditional god. During the Babylonian invasions and the subsequent deportations, Jeremiah and Ezekiel predicted that national restoration would occur only when the teachings of the prophets, concerning the acceptance of Yahweh, should take root. They pointed out that the misfortune of the Jews was due not only to their sins, but to the lack of unity of belief.

Any animosity shown the Jews came then from causes other than religious differences. The various kingdoms then inhabiting the earth possessed a comparatively high degree of civilization. Each was occupied with the construction of roads, canals, and other public enterprises. Each state sought commercial and political advantages over the other. History clearly demonstrates the axiomatic proposition that states always seek advantageous positions in the world affairs. The corollary to this proposition is that the same states always want to exert influence on their neighboring states, without being, in turn, influenced by them. Each is in a "State of Nature"[2] to the other. Such a relationship characterized the states of the ancient world.

Even after the dispersion of the Jews, when the acceptance of the monotheistic principle was widespread among them, religion was not the basic cause of antipathy. Deprived of statehood and dispersed

[2] Bryce, James, *International Relations*, pp. 3ff. Bryce uses this phrase to suggest the natural antipathy of one state for another.

throughout strange lands—in which they were racial minorities—the monotheistic principle as preached by Jeremiah and Ezekiel found fertile ground. But at that time also the polytheism of other states was being criticized by the more educated classes, who revealed tendencies towards monotheism. In the Greek world, men like Plato, Aristotle, and Xenophanes were bringing into question "on moral grounds the popular beliefs about the gods and goddesses, and ridiculed the anthropomorphic conceptions which the Greeks had formed of their divinities."[3] The teachings of the Epicureans, Stoics, and Sceptics also tended toward a departure from polytheism.

In the Roman world a questioning attitude towards polytheism was taken by the educated classes. "If the Gods are insulted, let them see to it themselves," said the Emperor Tiberius. Most of the leading men did not believe in the official religion of the state and considered it necessary only as a means of keeping the uneducated in order.[4] We find thus, that a departure from polytheism, or at least a questioning attitude towards it, was developing in the Greek Roman, and Jewish civilizations at about the same time.

What little amount of antipathy existed was due to the nationalistic tendencies of states. The ancient state was based on community of cult observances. Any deviation from these cult observances necessarily had to be suppressed because it would undermine the foundation of the state.

---

[3] Bury, J. B., *History of Freedom of Thought*, p. 23.
[4] *Ibid*, pp. 38ff.

For the most part punishment was meted out to individuals and not to whole sects. Thus Socrates, Theophrastus, and others of prominence were persecuted. Any punishment meted out to whole peoples was due to the desire of the state to suppress strong minorities. We find that at one time the Syrians and Jews punished the Greeks, and at other times the Syrians and Greeks punished the Jews. The Romans treated the Jews no worse than they treated any other subject people. "If in 150 B. C. E. the term Iudaei had reached the ears of the men in the street, it denoted a Syrian principality existing, like all other principalities, at sufferance and upon the condition of good behavior."[5]

Being classified as Syrians did not raise the Jews in the esteem of the people, particularly in Rome. However, it was not until the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B. C.[6] that persecution of the Jews took definite form. Now, a large number of Jews came to the attention of Rome. A large group, divergent in belief, customs, laws, race and mode of living had to be dealt with. The unity of Rome was threatened.

And yet, the assimilation of such a divergent group into the body of the non-Jewish world could have been brought about by peaceful, slow, social evolution. The problem of assimilation was not new to Rome. Other subject peoples had been incorporated in the body politic of the Roman Empire.

---

[5] Radin, Max, *The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 215.

[6] *Ibid*, pp. 227ff.

A new power—Christianity—was arising at this time. This power was to defeat any assimilative tendencies on the part of the Jews and place them before Rome in a light hitherto unknown. This new power soon furnished better grounds for persecution.[7]

As long as the Jews kept monotheism among themselves the Roman state was as tolerant towards them as towards any other subject people. The new Jews—the Christians—raised a new question. Unlike other subject peoples, the new Jews refused not only to subject themselves to their polytheistic conquerors, but proceeded to convert the pagans of the Roman state to Christianity. The danger of a successful proselytizing sect within the state threatened the power of the Emperor. Under Polytheism the Emperor was recognized as a half-god. Now, however, he found himself threatened with loss of influence. This political point of view was taken by the Emperors Domitian and Trajan. Since the early Christians were known to the Romans as a sect of the Jews, all Jews were placed in the same category; that of an isolated group ultimately endangering the solidarity of the Empire. Both sects were therefore persecuted as one.

[7] *Ibid*, pp. 164ff.

CHAPTER II

THE JEWS DURING THE RISE OF CHRISTIANITY

After Christianity superseded polytheism, the persecution of the Jews remained basically nationalistic and not religious. In the Roman world, Christianity developed into the state religion. By the third century Christianity was quite openly tolerated throughout the Empire. The new power was by this time quite definitely established on a road that was opposed to Judaism as well as to the Roman belief. The apologists of Christianity more or less disguised their hatred toward the civilization in which they lived. But, "any reader of the Christian literature of the time could not fail to see that in a state where Christians had power there would be no tolerance of other religious practices."[1] When Constantine placed the power of the state behind Christianity, the new Church "embarked on the hopeful enterprise of bringing about a complete uniformity in men's opinions."[2]

As the church developed, its dominance became political, as well as religious. Christianity, as Judaism, and later Moslemism, believed itself destined to universality. The rapid rise to power of the Catholic

[1] Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 52.

Church over the disintegrating body of the Roman Empire gave to Christianity the organization necessary for universality. While the anti-Semitism of the church was at first confined to controversies, it underwent a severe change when the church was accepted by Constantine and later succeeded to Rome. As a corollary to the purpose of making Christianity universal, the principle arose that a Christian state should not tolerate within its borders any religion other than that of prescribed Christianity. As a result, the church "began a more or less definite policy of coercing thought."[3] Unable to convert the Jews quickly enough and unwilling to accept them in the body politic of a universal Church-State, the church took measures to accomplish by force what might have been accomplished only by slow social evolution. Such measures failed in their purpose and succeeded only in further dispersing the Jews and bringing about the economic, political, and social conditions with which the Jews have so long been identified.

However, a new movement, the Renaissance, a reaction to the darkened centuries of medieval Europe, was developing even before the church attained its greatest power in Europe.

By the end of the thirteenth century, the Holy Roman Empire had succeeded in converting the hordes that harassed it, had repulsed Islam, and had made itself supreme in Europe through the alliances with the

[3] *Ibid*, p. 52.

various princes of its own creation. However, before this supremacy had been gained, new factors were undermining the Holy Roman Church-State. As early as the eleventh century the merchants of the Italian peninsula, through their contact with the countries of the Eastern Merditerranean, were bringing into Europe the classics of the ancient Greeks. The political philosophy of Socrates, Plato, and others was again read. At this time the Italian peninsula consisted of a number of petty states, each seeking to out-rival the other in power, but all subservient to the Holy Church. For a long time the church had been exploiting its authority for temporal gain. "Temporal ambitions," says Bryce, "so invaded and corrupted the church that the Pope and the bishops lost by degrees their moral authority and found their spiritual weapons blunted by having been frequently abused for non-spiritual ends." The infiltration of the political philosophy, of the classics into the petty Italian states, now resulted in a questioning attitude towards the supreme power itself.

Such an attitude did not confine itself to the Italian peninsula. A self-consciousness was taking place in other parts of Europe, particularly in the many German kingdoms and in England. It was not long until the rulers of these lands questioned papal authority. By the end of the fifteenth century it was only a question of time until there would be a break-up of the Holy Roman Empire.

The Reformation, or the separation of protesting European States from the Holy Church-State, affected

but slightly the status of the Jews. They continued to be persecuted for basically nationalistic reasons.

The Reformation was not a revolt of reason against dogma but of anti-clerical feeling against an international Holy Roman Church-State. It merely accentuated the political divisions of Europe, each of which was desirous of gaining the ascendency over the other. It did not create religious freedom. The various sects arising in the Counter-Reformation were as violent in their denunciation of each other as was the Catholic Church in its denunciation of Protestantism. Along with Protestantism, the Reformation created a number of new politico-religious organizations, such as the German-Protestant States, and the English-Anglican State. "The only result of the appearance of the new religion in the field of politics might seem to have been to add a new cause for war, either against non-Christian or as between one section of Christians and another. Instead of bringing together into one body men of different faiths, it created a distinction between those within and those without the pale which provided a reason for aggression and an excuse for ferocity."[4]

Much credit is given Luther for the final separation from the Holy Roman Empire. However, he merely led a religious movement away from the Catholic Church at a time when the Holy Roman Church-State was being broken up by the rise of a number of self-conscious states. It is quite reasonable to believe

[4] Bryce, J., *op cit.*, pp. 11, 12.

that Luther would have failed had it not been for the impetus lent by the emperors and princes of the revolting states. In Germany, the Reformation owed its success to the secular interest of princes, who profited by the confiscation of church lands. In England there was no popular movement; the change was carried through by the government for its own purposes.[5]

The Reformation, as has been said, affected, but slightly, the status of the Jews. Instead of being persecuted by the Holy Roman Church-State alone, they were now persecuted by the Papacy, the political organization of Catholic Christianity and by the new politico-religious organizations of Protestant Christianity. In order to withstand further attacks Paul III (1534) reorganized the Papacy and the resources of the church for a struggle of centuries. That organization did not take the form of a reform movement. Instead it created the Jesuit Order, the Inquisition, and the Index, to suppress dissension more effectively than before. The effect of such reorganization was to further disperse the Jews and make of them a most undesirable people in any community.

In the new politico-religious states the Jews fared but slightly better than in Catholic Europe. The German-Protestant States and the English-Anglican State did not want the Jews in their Christian midst. The principle of nationality, of uniformity in men's ideas, of similarity of racial background, and of common tradition could not be worked out in a state where there

[5] Bury, J. B., *op. cit.*, p. 76.

existed a number of people possessed of a divergent faith and existing in a diaspora.

Yet some change must be noted. The Peace of Westphalia (1642), chiefly in the Treaty of Osnabrück and the Treaty of Münster, placed Roman Catholicism and Protestantism on an equal footing. This was somewhat of a stimulus to the cause of religious liberty; one instance is the campaign for religious toleration during the Commonwealth in England.

The very multiplicity of religions that arose naturally divided the number of adherents of the Holy Church. Since the State was primarily secular, and was busy competing with other States, it had to become tolerant, to a degree, of the various sects that grew out of the dissension following the Protestant movement. Further, such toleration became necessary, due to the struggle between the Reformation and Counter-Reformation.

The rise of the bourgeoise and commerce also enhanced the position of the Jews. When Manasseh Ben Israel left for England, the Dutch feared that his departure might result in a general departure of Jews and instructed their ambassador in London to find out Manasseh's intentions. He reported that "Manasseh Ben Israel hath been to see me, and did assure me that he doth not desire anything for the Jews in Holland but only for those as sit in the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal."[6] In Hamburg, the Senate on one occasion

[6] Sombart, W., *Jews and Modern Capitolism*, pp. 19, 20. Thurloe, *Collection of State Papers, IV*, p. 333.

asked that the Jews be allowed to build synagogues because otherwise they might leave. In 1697, when expulsion was being considered, the merchants asked that the Jews be allowed to remain as their departure might endanger Hamburg's commerce.[7] In England, the Jews found a protector in Cromwell, who was actuated solely by consideration of an economic nature.[8] In an ordinance to the Intendent of Languedoc, Colbert pointed out the benefits that Marseilles derived from the enterprise of the Jews.[9]

At such times the Jews suffered no persecution. Only when Jewish traders offered strong competition to the Christian business men was there a hostile attitude toward them. Though arisings, for this reason, were quite numerous during the period, what we wish to emphasize is that the Jews were tolerated when the interest of the community made it necessary that they be tolerated. When those interests seemingly did not necessitate the presence of the Jews, intolerance was rife. Regardless of religion, the Jew was tolerated at one time and not tolerated at another. A few examples of the causes of intolerance during this period bear this out.

In 1712 and 1717 the citizens of Magdeburg objected to the Jews "because the welfare of the city, and the success of traders depends upon the fact that—no

[7] Sombart, W., *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[8] *Ibid*, p. 17. Kaufmann, D., Article "The Expulsion of the Marranoes from Venice in 1550," in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XIII.

[9] Sombart, W., *op. cit.*, p. 17.

Jewish dealing is permitted here."[10] Religion did not deter people from buying from Jews when they could buy cheaper. When Jews were expelled from Nuremberg in 1469, a number of them settled in Furth, a neighboring town. Since customers came to them from Nuremberg the City Fathers of Nuremberg created "ordinances on the town throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, forbidding dealings with Jews from Furth."[11] This same condition existed elsewhere. It was because of the English merchants that the Jews' Naturalization Bill of 1753 had to be repealed in the following year. These are but a few of the many examples of intolerance, all fostered by materialistic determinism.

[10] *Ibid*, p. 116.
[11] *Ibid*, p. 117.

CHAPTER III

THE JEWS IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

The period of Internationalism, following the Counter-Reformation, gave birth to tolerance towards the Jews.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a movement, carried through by political philosophers, and by dissenters, born of the dissension following the Reformation, resulted in the separation of church from state.

The writings of Bacon, Hobbes, Charron, Gassendi, Bayle and others tended to separate science from religion and placed emphasis on the scientific, rather than on the religious interpretation of morals.[1]

England, at a time of successful colonial expansion, was being retarded by a religious struggle. The extinction of religious liberty by the kings and the Anglican Church brought forth John Locke's *Letters Concerning Toleration* in 1689. He advanced the argument that the State has only material interests and should not occupy itself with religious matters. The 'Divine Right' of kings was questioned. Dissenters

[1] Kropotkin's Prince, A., *History of Ethics.* A short but scholarly piece of work, the whole of which might well be read for general knowledge of the subject.

protested the right of government and established church to proscribe their belief.

When the Commonwealth of Cromwell was established, the Jews, who had been banished by Edward I in 1290, began openly to take up residence in England. Such privilege, however, was only granted after a number of Jews had gained prominence in the colonies. In 1718 Attorney-General Sir Robert Raymond decided that a Jew born in England could purchase and enjoy lands in fee. By the Naturalization Act of 1740 they were relieved of receiving the sacrament before naturalization. The "Jew Bill" of 1753 proposed that Jewish residents in England be qualified for naturalization. The Government, in its efforts to push the bill through, argued that it would be beneficial to trade, in which Jews played an important part. The bill was finally passed, though later repealed because of the opposition of non-Jewish merchants. Aside from these evidences of tolerance, England was perhaps the first state to intervene on behalf of the Jews when, in 1744-45, Maria Theresa expelled them from Bohemia and Moravia.[2] The tolerant attitude of the English-speaking world may best be seen in the accordance of complete equality soon after the revolt of the American colonies from the mother country.

In France, the 'Encyclopædists', among whom were Diderot, Holbach, D'Alembert and such political philosophers as Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Mirabeau,

[2] Wolf, Lucien, *Notes on Diplomatic History of the Jewish Question.* Sec. 11-A.

sought unmodified freedom of conscience and an all-inclusive franchise. The theory that a state was a 'social contract' between individuals united by free choice had been developing for a number of generations. Supreme power rested in the body politic created by such a contract. In short, the contract conceived of a state wherein all were free to exist as they saw fit, the only restraint being self-imposed and administered by such governors as existed by the will of the people. Rousseau's *Social Contract,* published in 1762, came at a propitious time and lent impetus to the 'contract' theory. The time had come when the French monarch could no longer control the populace. Wars had so depleted the French treasury, and had left the people in such a miserable state, that a complete overthrow of everything reminding of the monarchy was demanded. The revolution could not be avoided. The political philosophers had sown their seeds well. The demand of generations of thinkers for a reorganized state was realized.[3]

The revolution, among other things, resulted in the enfranchisement of the Jews. On November 13, 1791, Louis XVI conferred full equalization upon the Jews in France.[4] Only during such a period as preceded the French Revolution could Mirabeau, (b. 1749; d. 1791) have said, "If you wish the Jews to become better men

[3] Dunning, W. A., *Political Theories from Rousseau to Spencer,* pp. 16ff. Randall, J. H., *The Making of the Modern Mind,* pp. 180ff, pp. 370ff.

[4] Graetz, H., *History of the Jews,* V, p. 448.

and useful citizens, then banish every humiliating distinction, open to them every avenue forbidding them agriculture, handicrafts, and the mechanical arts, encourage them to devote themselves to these occupations."[5] Mirabeau, intimate with Mendelssohn's circle, it might be well to mention, refuted the arguments of Michaelis and the Göttingen guild of scholars against the naturalization of the Jews. At an assembly meeting on August 23, 1789, Mirabeau said, "The unrestricted freedom of belief is so sacred in my eyes, that even the word tolerance sounds despotic to me. . . ."[6] Due to his influence and part in the French Revolution it is necessary to quote but once more from Mirabeau. "There is only one thing to be lamented, that so highly gifted a nation should so long have been kept in a state wherein it was impossible for its powers to develop, and every far-sighted man must rejoice in the acquisition of useful fellow citizens from among the Jews."[7]

Influenced by the French rationalists, the Germans turned to biblical criticism, seeking, not to disprove dogma, but rather to estimate the value, the chronology and the origin of the texts. Wagenseil and Buxtorf searched not only the New, but the Old Testament. Though they attacked the Jew for some things they declared him innocent of others for which he had hitherto been accused.

---

[5] *Ibid,* p. 443.
[6] *Ibid,* p. 439.
[7] *Ibid,* p. 433.

The political facts of the period in Germany also aided to dispel intolerance. Frederick emerged from the Seven Years' War with a strong allegiance with Russia in June, 1762, instead of disruption of Prussia, as had once been threatened. Frederick encouraged and surrounded himself with many of the leading French philosophers of the day.

Religious life, as in other countries, had taken a turn in Germany. The simple pietism of Spencer and Francke had been welcomed against the stiff, dogmatic Lutheran faith. But now pietism was being displaced by the "Aufklärung." At this time Frederick the Great announced that "every one could get to heaven in his own way."[8]

Not of minor importance in the political and intellectual awakening of Germany was Moses Mendelssohn. He, as were Lessing and Wolff, was a leader of the "Aufklärung." They "exhorted their countrymen to discard superstition and use their reason without fear. . . . During the generation of peace which followed the Seven Years' War, Germany learned to read and began to ask questions."[9] The effect of this is obvious. Publicists and journalists arose to denounce the princes. The writings of Rousseau and the triumph of the American colonies nourished the spirit of revolt in the German writers. "I write as a citizen of the world,

[8] Gooch, George P., *Germany*, p. 97; *Germany and the French Revolution*, Part 1, Ch. 1. Francke, Kuno, *Social Movements in German Literature.*

[9] Gooch, G. P., *Germany*, p. 4.

who serves no prince,"[10] cried Schiller. "German Nationalism," said another, "was a political monstrosity."[11] With few exceptions the French revolution was welcomed by German spokesmen as an omen of German liberty. The principle of cosmopolitanism, of the brotherhood of man, of freedom, was gaining ascendancy over nationalism, race difference, religious and civil inequality.

Only at such a time could a Mendelssohn be accepted in the highest circles of Germany. Only at such a time could he have conferred upon him the honor "Schutz Jude". His relationship with the state could not but enhance the position of the Jews. A profound philosopher, Mendelssohn, was able to attract the friendship of a man like Lessing, who aided to dispel the malignant accusations hurled against the Jews.

In Catholic Austria, Joseph I issued a series of laws relating to the Jews. By an act of October 19, 1781, the Jews were permitted, with certain restrictions, to engage in the arts, sciences, handicrafts, and agriculture. By the Ordinance of November 2, 1781, all Jews were to be considered as "fellow-men." The Body-Tax was abolished. Joseph I went so far as to invite Jewish reformers from Germany to dispel the fears of the orthodox for the innovations.[12]

Even Russia fell into the spirit of the times. The effect upon the Jews was not noted, however, until the

[10] *Ibid*, p. 5.
[11] *Ibid*, p. 5.
[12] *Ibid*, pp. 357ff.

beginning of the nineteenth century, when Alexander 1, in 1802, ordered a "Committee for the Amelioration of the Jews" to be organized. In 1804 his ukase was published, abolishing exceptional laws, against university graduates, farmers, manufacturers, and artisans.[18] This, however, was made ineffective by subsequent limitations.

And yet, our story does not end here. The "Social Contract" was found wanting. Based on the premise that man is a rational being, the "Social Contract," pure Democracy, had to fail. Man was found wanting in rationalism. Only a few were capable of rational judgment. The French Revolution, its attendant terrors and the subsequent reversion to long accepted beliefs, proved man's irrationality. Mankind was not prepared for the theory of "Rights of Man." The reaction, like all reactions, swung to the extreme, from internationalism to an intense nationalism. Attendant on the reaction was the abolishment of Jewish rights and the revival of Nationalism as a cause of anti-Semitism.

[18] Kornilov, Alex., *Modern Russian History*, p. 106.

CHAPTER IV

THE JEWS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

GERMANY

The nineteenth century witnessed a revival of nationalism as the cause of anti-Semitism. While liberalism, of its very nature cosmopolitan, was surging toward revolution in France, another movement was gaining momentum in Prussia—that of absolutism, of its very nature reactionary, nationalistic and the antithesis of cosmopolitanism.

Beginning with Kant and taken up by Fichte and Hegel, and finally expressed by policies of Bismarck and enforced by the military power of William II in our own day, we see a continuity of aim resulting in the intense nationalism of modern Germany.

When revolution began in Europe, Kant was the recognized leader of German philosophy. His doctrine that the people is the sovereign and supreme law-maker is Rousseau's. However, when, in his *Critique of Pure Reason,* he held moral obligation as being limitless and above reason he carried Rousseau's theory a step further—to the moral duty of man.[1] By calling upon the

[1] Dewey, J., *German Philosophy and Politics,* p. 24.

individual "to sacrifice property and life for the good of the community," Bernhardi says of Kant, "he gave the clearest expression to the idea of the state and created a sound basis on which the claims of individual rights might rest."[2] "Man in his rational or universal capacity, must, therefore, will an outward order of harmony in which it is at least possible for acts dictated by rational freedom to get a footing. Such an outer-order is the State. . . . And so necessary is the state to humanity's realization of its moral purpose that there can be no right of revolution."[3] From these few quotations may be seen the theory that the state is the "All," and the individual that part that exists only so far as he is of value or of service to the state and not to himself as such.

Withal, Kant was an 18th century cosmopolitan. Sitting in Königsberg, he did not foresee that his enlargement of the doctrine of the "Rights of Man" would be carried to an extreme by later philosophers and made to fit the imperialistic policies of future historical philosophers and statesmen.

Not until the threatened domination of Europe by Napoleon was cosmopolitanism given a death blow. Germany was the greatest sufferer from these wars. Fichte, who in his earlier writings justified the French Revolution with doctrines similar to those of Rousseau, soon shifted his attention from the individual and his rights to the people and the nation. ". . . It is easy

[2] Bernhardi, F. B., *Germany and the Next War*, pp. 63, 64.
[3] Dewey, J., *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 67.

to detect a marked difference of attitude toward the nationalistic state before and after 1806, when in the battle of Jena, Germany went down to inglorious defeat."[4] Fichte now sought the cause of Germany's failure. Obviously, the only thing which saved Germany was the strong centralized power of Prussia. Fichte had attributed Germany's failure to the lack of political consciousness. His *Addresses to the German People* set forth an exalted conception of the character and mission of the Germans. He called for New Germans; he sought trained men. He now held that there cannot be a state where man in the plural possesses natural right, but rather, that the State is man's natural condition. In other words, man does not possess natural rights, as there is a moral obligation between men that can only exist in Statehood. Thus Fichte, like Kant, based the state on morals. He, however, went a step further when he demanded an absolute unity of the state. Further, he proclaimed that "to be economically exclusive was of the same significance as to be exclusive in legislation. . . . What is suitable to the present is an economic solidarity and exclusiveness among fellow-citizens."[5]

The climax of the German Idealism in political history was reached in Hegel. The fundamental fact in a state is the political consciousness of a people. The consciousness determines the constitution. Of the three powers, the legislative, administrative and the mon-

[4] *Ibid*, p. 68.
[5] Dunning, W. A., *op. cit.*, p. 144.

archic, the last is held as being most important. It is the unifying force through which the other two are restrained from disrupting the state. Hegel also proclaimed the state to be outside of law, and war to be inevitable in the establishment and preservation of national individuality.

Thus, by the time of the Congress of Vienna, political theory had undergone a change from individual equality to that of national consciousness. Constitutionalism, which was formerly advanced as being possible only in a democratic state, came to be possible in a monarchic state, subject, however, to the will of the monarch.

Everything that reminded of French cosmopolitanism, of the revolution, was abhorrent to the reaction. This is seen particularly in the Holy Alliance, created by the Treaty of September, 1815, between Russia, Austria and Prussia. Because of the many sovereigns deposed and created by Napoleon, the only safety for royalty seemed to be in the principle of legitimacy. The allies brought together by the Congress of Vienna, and Aix La Chapelle became an active repressant to any democratic expressions. Vested interests of church and nobility were reborn.

Together with the religious tenor of the Holy Alliance, the political philosophy after 1815 tended very strongly along theological lines.[6] This quality was distinctive of Schleiermacher and the Romanticists. Ro-

[6] Randall, J. H., *op. cit.*, ch. 16.

manticism was a movement essentially reactionary in character, which turned the imaginative mind from classicism to medieval paths. The romantic school, Schlegel,[7] Arnim,[8], and Brentano,[9] pictured to the Germans medieval Europe and its degraded Jewry. The word 'Christian-German' arose. Some of the prominent men of Germany even embraced Catholicism and helped re-establish the Jesuits and the Inquisition.

Judeophobia waxed in strength as these influences spread. Schleiermacher's[10] antipathy to the Jews was so intense that he decried the Jewish origin of Jesus as unfortunate and merely accidental. His influence made him a leader of Judeophobia. Though the Jews might be accorded rights as citizens, Schleiermacher held that they should only be tolerated as a special sect. Goethe and Fichte also held the Jews in contempt. Both were antagonistic to the church and abhorred the Jews because of their part in the religious growth of Europe. Of the two, Fichte was the most bitter. He opposed any emancipation of the Jews. Graetz quotes from Fichte, "The only way I see by which civil rights can be conceded to them is to cut off all their heads in one night, and to set new ones on their shoulders, which should contain not a single idea. The only means of

[7] Schlegel, Friedrich Von, philosopher and critic (1772-1829).

[8] Arnim, Ludwig Joachim, was a German politician (1781-1831).

[9] Brentano, Clemens, German novelist and dramatist (1778-1842).

[10] Schleiermacher, Friedrich Ernest Daniel, German theologian, philosopher, orator (1768-1834).

protecting ourselves against them is to conquer their highly-praised land and send them thither." Graetz goes on to say that, "Fichte may be regarded as the father and apostle of a national instinctive German hatred of the Jews, of a kind hitherto unknown, or rather never before so clearly manifested".[11]

In addition to those mentioned a host of writers directed their efforts against the Jews. A number of them ridiculed the Jew; some asked whether or not the Jew could retain his present condition without harm to the state; others questioned his ability to be enfranchised; and others considered him a distinct impediment.

As a result of the influence of these various men, a political theory was developed which considered the Jews distinct hindrances in its application. Jesuitry, re-established, was working with increased vigor in its persecution of the Jews, while statesmen were taking away rights hitherto accorded. For example, a compromise effected in the Act of Federation of German States, conferring citizenship upon the Jews, was made null and void by the changing of one word by Senator Schmidt, the deputy for Bremen.[12] In Austria, Francis II and Metternich forgot the work of Joseph II and forced the Jews back into the ghettos.

In Prussia disabilities and persecution were particularly noted in the municipal reforms of Von Stein.

---

[11] Graetz, H., *op. cit.*, V, pp. 491ff.

[12] "Jewish Rights at the Congresses of Vienna (1814-1815), and Aix-La-Chapelle (1818)." *American Jewish Historical Society*, XXVI, pp. 33ff.

In his reformation of the city governments, all were recognized as burghers except Jews, Mennonites, and criminals. Hep! Hep! uprisings, which began in Würzburg, spread to Bamberg, Frankfort, and other cities. Factories and stores were broken into and many Jews were killed. These uprisings even spread to the Danish capitol and could only be quelled by martial law.[13]

While these occurrences revived the conditions of the middle ages there was no reactionary effect upon the Jewish mind. The progressive precepts of Mendelssohn, Lessing, and others were not forgotten. The fearlessness and success of these philo-Semites taught the Jews the lesson of self-respect. The heritages of these men enabled the Jews to withstand their reactionary surroundings. From the soil of medievalized Germany there arose a brilliant assemblage of minds who sprang to the defense of their oppressed brethren. A Rappaport, and a Luzzatto engaged in numerous controversies with Judeophobes. A Heine, and a Börne reduced the accusations of the anti-Semites to absurdities. Later, Gabriel Riesser taught Jewry to contest maligners and take part in public affairs. While controverting the libels of Paulus, Edward Mayer, Pfizer, and others, Riesser managed to have the question of Jewish amelioration and civil rights placed on the programme of the Liberalists of Prussia.[14] In an address in the Prussian Landtag he called its members

[13] Graetz, H., *op. cit.*, V, pp. 531ff.
[14] Graetz, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 601ff.

to look upon equality, not as "a gift of begging, but as a right to be demanded."[15]

Factors which admitted their voices to be heard cannot be overlooked. The reaction following the Napoleonic era failed. It made no greater progress than did the 'contract' theory.[16] The Bund, which was merely a loose aggregation of states, failed to unify Germany. It was merely the "tool of Metternich, in whose eyes constitutions conjured up the hated spectre of French Jacobinism."[17] The middle classes, due to the rise of industrialism, were gaining in strength. The rumble of the impending revolution of 1848 was already being heard. The loudest cry was that of 'Constitutionalism.' Also "A ray of hope was shed by the French Revolution of 1830. . .and the regime of reaction was assailed from abroad by the scintillating raillery of Heine and Börne,"[18] both Jews. However, not until the accession of Frederick William IV in 1840 was there any gesture of reform.[19] Among the first acts of the king was the return to their chairs of a number of deposed professors. The censorship was modified. In 1847, the king summoned eight Provincial Diets to a meeting in Berlin.[20] In 1848, influential Liberals were able to demand a German Parlia-

[15] Karpeles, Gustav, *Jews and Judaism in the 19th Century*, pp. 26ff.
[16] Gooch, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
[17] *Ibid*, p. 13.
[18] *Ibid*, p. 14.
[19] *Ibid*, p. 15.
[20] *Ibid*, p. 16.

ment.[21]. The French Revolution of 1848 and the subsequent revolution over Europe finally forced the constitution of 1850 upon Prussia.[22]

The importance of these political facts to the Jewish problem lies in the fact that among the most influential members of the movement for Constitutionalism and political liberty were a number of Jews. Aside from Börne, Heine, and Reisser were the Jews Ferdinand LaSalle and Karl Marx. The presence of these and other prominent Jews in the movement and in the National Liberal party, could not but enhance the position of the Jews. Thus in 1850, the Prussian constitution made civic rights independent of creed. Not until 1871 however, with the adoption of the German constitution was complete equality accorded the Jews in all of Germany.

The revolution of 1848, though it was the cause of Jewish emancipation in Prussia, was followed by a reaction which placed Jewry in a situation hitherto unknown, one devoid of religious hatred and based purely on politics and economics. It started as a political move, by promoters who desired to discredit the Liberals and Socialists through the Jews. It also took on a new form of antipathy based on so-called racial differences.

The greatest influence in the modern anti-Semitic movement may be said to have been Bismarck. While he was liberal at first, reinstating professors who had

[21] *Ibid,* p. 17.
[22] *Ibid,* p. 21.

been ejected from their positions and allowing the eight local diets of the kingdom to be represented in a United Prussian Diet, he took care that the diet should have merely advisory and legislative powers. When the National Parliament, representing the entire German people, failed to accomplish anything and left Germany as disunited as it had ever been, Bismarck turned reactionary. Nauseated with the mob rule of the revolution, Bismarck realized that only great personages could unify Germany; that Constitutionalism could not. "No power on earth shall ever succeed in persuading me to exchange the natural relation between king and people for a conventional constitutional one; neither now or ever will I permit a written sheet, like a second providence, to thrust itself in between our God in heaven and this land, to displace the old sacred fidelity."[23]

Germany had entered a new economic and political period, a new direction in practical life. Bismarck felt that the claims of society should receive prior consideration to those of the individual. The state itself should make laws and do business. The state should maintain and promote the interest of the nation. State socialism should replace individual enterprise as much as possible. The state should be paternalistic. Bismark held the people, as we have said, incapable of unification. Only such men as the Great Elector and Frederick the Great were considered by

[23] White, Andrew Dickson, *Seven Great Statesmen*, p. 396.

him capable of unifying and creating a state such as he wished to establish. The Jew could have no part in Bismarck's state. "I should like to see the state," said Bismarck on April 22, 1881, "which for the most part consists of Christians—penetrated to some extent by the principle of the religion it professes. . ."[24] ". . .A state, if it would have assured permanence, if it would only justify its existence, when it is disputed," said Bismarck before the Prussian United Diet on June 15, 1847, "must stand on a religious foundation. . .I believe I am right in calling that state a Christian state which seeks to realize the teaching of Christianity."[25] He opposed, against the emancipation of the Jews, the idea of the Christian state, insisting that, since princes were intrusted to rule on earth in accordance with 'God's Will,' or Christian principle, this end could not in any way be promoted by the help of the Jews.

Bismarck held Jewry as unfit and undesirable for obvious reasons. Many of them were industrialists with connections throughout the world. Writers accused them of being the new manipulators, sweaters of the new industrial age, and constitutional liberals. Aside from this there was much pre-existing anti-Semitic literature which had stamped the Jew as an undesirable, a parasite, a state within a state.

The severest anti-Semitism which arose in later years

[24] Dawson, William Harbutt, *Bismarck and State Socialism*, p. 24.
[25] *Ibid*, pp. 23, 24.

was due perhaps in a large measure to Bismarck's international policy. Ever ready to grasp any advantageous position, Bismarck made friends with Russia during the Crimean War to obtain her neutrality or aid in case of a war with Austria. The Polish revolt of 1863 against Russia still further cemented relations between Prussia and Russia. In order to curry favor with Russia, Bismarck opposed the Poles. Since many of the Polish leaders were Jews, Bismarck's aversion for them increased.

In respect to Bismarck's internal Polish policy, Delbrück wrote, "These measures of internal policy had various implications in the international field, among them an intention on Bismarck's part to strengthen the bonds of the League of the Three Emperors. Oppression of the Poles was one of Prussia's traditional methods of currying favor with Russia."[26] It must be remembered here that East Prussia was inhabited by many Poles. It was to his interest as well as to Russia's that the Poles be subdued. It might also be well to note here that Bismarck was never able to Germanize his Poles; that they retained their Polish consciousness and took advantage of the first opportunity to unite with their brethren during the World War. Not without reason did Bismarck and the Czar dispatch thousands of poverty-stricken Jews into Poland. Bismarck and the Czar knew that the best means of keeping Poland 'dead' was to create an internal problem there. For

[26] Fuller, Joseph V., *Bismarck's Diplomacy at Its Zenith*, pp. 55, 56.

what other reason were thousands of the poorest Jews forced into Poland and only those possessing a certain number of thalers allowed to remain in Prussia?

Bismarck's influence was not only confined to Germany and Russia. It spread to Austria. Despite the defeat of 1866, Austria-Hungary was not averse to learning from the Germans and adopting their ideas and methods of Jew-baiting. Von Schoenerer was one of the first to begin a distinct anti-Semitic move. (Incidentally he was the Protestant German spokesman of Pan-Germanism in Austria). When a member of the Reichsrath, in 1882, he initiated a movement among university students, incited the masses to violence, and sought to bring about legislative measures against the admission of immigrants from Russia. Anti-Semitism became a party platform.

A vast literature also arose to aid Bismarck in his search for a "place in the sun" for Germany and in his anti-Semitic policy. A leading proponent of this policy was Heinrich Von Treitschke, a Prussian historian. "He did more than anyone to mould the minds of the rising generation. He supported the government in its attempts to subdue by legislation the Socialists, Poles, and Catholics; and he was one of the few men of eminence who gave the sanction of his name to the attacks on the Jews which began in 1878."[27]

Treitschke may be called the father of pedantic anti-

[27] *Encyclopedia Brit.*, Art. on Treitschke, Heinrich Von, XXVIII, p. 239.

Semitism.[28] In him, anti-Semitism became a systematic doctrine, part of a political creed. He hated them because they were unwarlike, because they were absorbed in material things, because they were atheists. He denounced the cynicism of Heine. But, above all, he hated them because they were denationalized and had no stake in the prosperity and greatness of the national state. They were wanderers without a settled existence or allegiance. Everywhere they were revolutionists and atheists. It was the duty of all Prussian patriots to guard the people against the Jewish danger, against Jewish journalism, finance, materialism, socialism and internationalism.

In a series of articles in *Preussische Jahrbucher* November 15, 1879 *et seq.,* Berlin, he pointed out the growing power of Jewish solidarity as a separate caste in Germany.

In his lectures on 'Politics'[29] he avowedly based his gospel of force upon the teachings of Machiavelli, who first saw clearly that the State is power. Therefore "to care for this power is the highest moral duty of the State," and "of all political weaknesses that of feebleness is the most abominable and despicable." The national State must be selfish. Therefore wipe out internationalism because it takes the form of the Catholic Church or the Social Democracy. He bitterly opposed the first because Prussia and Germany

[28] Sarolea, *German Principles and Personalities,* pp. 115, 116.

[29] *Encyclopedia Britannica, loc. cit.*

comprised a Lutheran Kultur-Staat and the second because it was cosmopolitan. The fact that LaSalle and Karl Marx were leaders of socialism and most of the Jews were of the Social Democracy could not but constitute sufficient cause for Jew-hatred on the part of Treitschke.

Another anti-Semitic writer of note was Stewart Chamberlain, the worshipper of German culture, of whom more will be said later. Another cause for Jew-hatred was found in the economic stress of the times. In 1875, articles appeared in the Kreüzzeitung of Berlin, the organ of Junkerthum, accusing the Jews of mismanagement and swindle.[30] The venom of the articles was directed against the political influence of Jews. The *Catholic Germania* called these articles "Articles upon the Jewish management of Affairs in Prussia and Germany," and followed them up itself by a series of articles upon the Jews. Catholic clergymen brought out denunciations of the Talmud and the Jewish religion.

Despite the various phases of the anti-Semitic movement, the foundation was economic and political. The economic difficulties in which the young empire found itself, as well as the increased power of the Social Democratic party, seemingly made a new social and political system necessary. This led, among other

[30] Records of the "Crash" in Berlin and Vienna beginning with 1870 show that some of the highest nobility in Prussia and Austria were implicated in many swindles. Sidney Whitman, *Teuton Studies*, 1895, pp. 54ff.

things, to the formation of the Christian Social Workingmen's party. In the foreground of the new movement was the court preacher Adolf Stöcker, who was author of the words: "All the evils of our economic life. . .which have matured the noxious fruit of Social Democracy, are to be traced in the last resort to the Jews." From 1880, anti-Semitism spread to the lecture rooms, and papers. That same year saw the foundation of an anti-Semitic League in Berlin. A petition was presented to the Chancellor suggesting political means of restraining Jewish power. The bulk of the Conservative party was openly in sympathy with the aims of the anti-Semitic movement. The Catholic party clamored for the admission of the Jesuits, in order that they might be unleashed against the Libermany candidates in Germany.

The movement was not confined to Germany alone. All of Austria, while torn apart politically, was in accord on the Jewish problem. This is particularly true of the Hussite Czechs, the Knights of the German-Kaiserblume, the Heralds of the Wotan Cult, and the Catholic Ultra-Montanes. Aside from Austria, the movement spread to Russia and other countries.

One great factor which tended to spread anti-Semitism over the whole of Europe and into various parts of the world must not be overlooked here. While an intense policy of nationalism and expansion must be noted from Frederick the Great through Bismarck, there were those who were obsessed with a still greater

ideal; that of Pan-Germanism.[31] These wished to weld together not only the people of Germany, but also those people with the Germans in the whole of Europe and the rest of the world. They dreamed of spreading German culture throughout the world regardless of ethnologic, political, and economic boundaries. This is known as Pan-Germanism.

A Pan-German league which had its birth in 1886 als and Jews. Anti-Semitism became the platform of in Berlin and began to exert an influence in the last decade of the century, mapped out a definite program whereby German world interests could be enhanced.

The principles of the league embraced the education of children in the German sense, opposed movements antagonistic to national development, supported all German national movements over the world, and promoted interests in Europe and across the seas. The League explained that in order to successfully carry out its principles, an active ethnographic policy must be preserved to suppress the enemies of Deutschtum within and without Germany. (The supposed enemies within were, of course, the Jews, Poles and Liberals). "It cannot be a matter of indifference to Germany whether the Saxons and Swabians are Magyarized or Germans in Switzerland or Flemish in Belgium are Gallicized." Germans must preserve national character. Some of the most influential men of Germany, includ-

[31] *The Pan-American Doctrine*, Harper & Bros., 1904. Author, Anonymous.

ing 41 members of the Reich in 1903, were members of the league.

The Pan-Germans possessed a comprehensive literature. It stressed the great past of the Germans. It sent out pictures like 'Germans to the Front,' representing Germans being ordered to the front by Admiral Seymour during the Pekin relief expedition. Copies of this picture and Houston Stewart Chamberlain's work, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century,* (a glorification of the German race, which he prophesied was destined to outstrip even the Anglo-Saxon race) were given away by the thousands and placed in all conspicuous places.[32] This is the same Chamberlain who had perhaps a greater influence in spreading the doctrine of Germanic superiority and Semitic inferiority than any other writer of the century with the possible exception of Treitschke.

The movement was powerful in Austria as well as in Germany.[33] The leaders of the party there, Wolff and Schoenerer, sought to effect a Lutheran Reformation in the Austrian empire. On November 5, 1898 Schoenerer propounded the Pan-German theory in Parliament.[34]

Of course Catholic or Slavish Austria took measures to stop the propaganda. Dr. Lueger said that it was wrong to speak of Catholicism as dangerous to Pan-Germany; that the movement was engineered to create chaos in Austria so that Germany might better be able

[32] *Ibid,* p. 35.
[33] *Ibid,* pp. 62ff.
[34] *Ibid,* p. 71.

to swallow her up. As a result of the movement, the Germans in Austria split. The Catholic Germans led by Dr. Leuger and his "Christian Socialists" were loyalists and Slavophile, Schoenerer and the Pan-Germans cried 'no Popery.'[35]

Both, however, were in accord on one principle—anti-Semitism. The Jews were anathema to both. The Jews were not wanted in a state of either the Catholic Austrians or the Pan-Germans.

Though expulsion, as such, had died out in Germany and Austria-Hungary, expulsion of another nature still continued to exist until the World War. Conditions became such that self-respecting Jews had to leave. Discrimination in schools, debates on the Jewish question in the Prussian Diet, and exclusion from all offices made life burdensome in Germany. Though the Kaiser lavished distinction on such promoters of German commerce as Albert Ballin and Consul Goldberger, he expressed himself adversely toward the Jews in various letters, one of which was written to Admiral Von Hallman.[36]

In Austria, Jewish and Christian children were separated in schools. There were uprisings in Galicia because nearly one-half of the land belonged to Jews. Anti-Semitic propaganda filled the universities. Even such an individual as Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk of the Czech University was ostracized, and persecuted because he denounced the anti-Semites. National

[35] *Ibid*, p. 87.
[36] *American Jewish Year Book* (1902-1903), p. 191.

movements among the different peoples resulted in anti-Semitic demonstrations.

As late as 1912 and 1913 when Germany and Austria-Hungary joined other nations in the cry for amelioration of the Jews, various discriminations continued to exist. Agitation against Jewish students particularly from Russia, led to the adoption of measures at Prussian, Saxon, and Bavarian universities to restrict them from those schools. Austria also witnessed agitation against Jewish students at the University of Lemburg and the University of Vienna.

Even during the war some Reichstag deputies belonging to the anti-Semitic *Economic Union* (*Wirtschaftliche Vereinigung*) petitioned the Imperial Chancellor to secure in the Peace Treaty a provision closing the present frontiers of the German Empire to Jewish immigration.[37]

Countless instances of discrimination might be mentioned. It is, however, unnecessary to do so here. They are but further proof that anti-Semitism is based on group-solidarity; that it is an attempt to amalgamate rapidly, or do away with a divergent group.

RUSSIA

The influence of the "enlightenment" epoch was felt in Russia. At her accession, Catherine, imbued with the philosophical tendencies of the "enlightenment epoch," intended to grant Russia an ideal, rational

[37] *Op. cit.* (1916-1917), p. 133.

legislation.[1] In this, she did not succeed. The only semblance of power was in the hands of the Procurator-General of the Senate. However, she did carry out some provincial and financial reforms.[2]

In the intellectual field, Catherine did more. During her reign German professors came to Russia to teach while French literature was introduced by such men as Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, and Diderot. For the future Czar, Alexander I, she procured as teacher, "the Swiss, La Harpe, whose discovery and selection Catherine owed to her connection with the best intellectual forces of contemporary France."[3] To his teachings must be ascribed, in a large measure, the era of reform which Alexander instituted at his accession.

The effect upon the Jews of the enlightenment in Russia was as beneficial, comparatively, as in other countries. Up until the annexation at the end of the eighteenth century of the Polish-Lithuanian province, which contained one million Jews, the Jewish question was of minor importance, involving mainly the permission for Jewish merchants to appear at little Russian fairs. This was regulated by a ukase of Catherine I in 1727, but was nullified by Elizabeth in 1741.[4] Under this latter ukase Catherine II expelled a large number of Jews from Russia. The great number of Jews brought into the empire with the annexation of Crimea, New Russia, and the partitions of Poland,

[1] Kornilov, A., *op. cit.*, I, p. 44.
[2] *Ibid*, pp. 44ff.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 68.
[4] *Ibid*, p. 105.

forced the Jewish question to the fore. Now, for the first time the idea of a Jewish pale of settlement was introduced into Russia. Although the Jews were forbidden to enter other parts of the Empire, they were given civil rights of the "middle sort" in the pale.[5] However, it was not until the accession of Alexander I in 1801, that the "enlightenment" was to serve the Jewish problem.

Alexander's education could not have helped but influence him. La Harpe, brought up on republican and democratic ideas, was Alexander's tutor from 1784 to 1795. "La Harpe instilled into Alexander a number of ideas and noble strivings. . ."[6] Because La Harpe refused to take part in Catherine's intrigues against Paul, he was dismissed. When he left, however, La Harpe gave Alexander some detailed intsructions and a program of reading.

Such contact made Alexander I, when he came to the throne, an enthusiast for the abolition of serfdom. He even gave money to further the socialistic experiments of Robert Owen and translations of Adam Smith, Bentham, Mably, Beccaria, and others.[7] "The first stage of Alexander's reign 1801-1805—is characterized by the Emperor's ardent and sincere reformatory activity, taken up on his own initiative—the period of most rosy, though indefinite, expectations on the part of the people."[8]

---

[5] *Ibid,* p. 105.
[6] *Ibid,* p. 70.
[7] *Ibid,* p. 101.
[8] *Ibid,* p. 66.

From the very first day of his reign Alexander demonstrated his desire for reform.[9] Some reforms for the benefit of the Jews were also to be enacted. The law of 1794, requiring Jews to pay double taxes in comparison with the taxes of Christian commoners and merchants was brought up in the Senate in 1802. A special committee was organized to investigate the origin of the discriminatory law. The result was the "Statute concerning the Jews"[10] of 1804. While the Jews were still forbidden residence outside the pale, the pale itself was expanded. The Jews were to enjoy "the protection of the law on equal basis with other Russian subjects." They were encouraged to take up farming but were forbidden to keep taverns in villages. The children were allowed to attend all primary schools, gymnasia, and universities. Special privileges were given to those who would learn Russian, Polish or German.

Thus did Russian Jewry witness the first sign of tolerance. As happened to be the case, the ukase was not a starting point for more tolerant reforms, but was merely the first and last example of tolerance shown Russian Jewry for many years.

The reaction, of course, undid what little had been accomplished. While the teachings of La Harpe were followed in the early years of Alexander's reign, the four years under Paul left an influence upon his character. The madness, the partiality, the eccentricities of the reign of his father left a stamp upon Alexander

[9] *Ibid*, pp. 79ff.
[10] *Ibid*, p. 106.

which, after a few years of earnest effort at reform, contributed to a reaction in the later years of his reign.

Not a less important cause of the reaction was the ambition of Napoleon and the subsequent failure of the French Revolution. "The veil has fallen," wrote Alexander to La Harpe; "Napoleon has deprived himself of the best glory which a mortal may achieve, the glory or proving that he worked disinterestedly for the good of his country, and, remaining loyal to the constitution to which he swore allegiance, after ten years resigning his power. Instead he has preferred to emulate monarchical courts, breaking thereby the constitution of his land."[11] In 1803 Alexander broke with Napoleon and proceeded to form a coalition against him. The war of 1805, as is known, ended disastrously. Nevertheless Alexander made preparations for its continuation. Desiring to enlist the aid of the masses he used the appeals of the Holy Synod. "In those appeals Napoleon was declared an enemy of mankind, who intended to proclaim himself a Messiah, and arouse the Jews to annihilate the Christian Church."[12]

Thus within the first five years of Alexander's reign we find the first semblance of reform for the Jews and also an inkling of future indictments against them. By 1815, with the formation of the "Holy Alliance," Alexander was quite definitely reactionary. At four different times up until 1813, Mikhail Speransky, who in four years rose from a private secretaryship to Prince

[11] *Ibid,* pp. 115, 116.
[12] *Ibid,* pp. 118, 119.

Kurskin to the rank of Imperial State-Secretary, was able to bring forward constitutionalist plans. However, none of these were ever carried out. By 1820, Alexander was an avowed enemy of liberal institutions and revolution and fell under the influence of bigots, obscurantists, and self-seekers.[13]

Unlike the reaction in Europe which sought to build and create, in Russia it sought to tear away from everything western and to revert to eastern culture. The influential thinkers in Russia were not free thinkers in religion or politics. The rise of free thought in Europe during the last half of the eighteenth century did not make a great impression on Russia. Catherine, though herself irreligious, saw the necessity of maintaining and encouraging religious belief to keep the ignorant masses in order. Thus the most influential Russian thinkers were never influenced by French ideas of freedom of conscience and action.

One of the most powerful men of the time, Karamzin, historian and adviser to both Alexander I and Nicholas I, was a representative of Old Russia. Karamzin, although not an obscurantist, held the views of Catherine "who considered that autocracy was necessary for the country, that without autocracy Russia would perish."[14] Influences from France also contributed to this theoretical formulation of the reaction in Russia. De Bonald and De Maistre were widely read in Russian high circles. "Chateaubriand likewise inspired St. Peters-

[13] *Ibid,* pp. 207ff.
[14] *Ibid,* p. 238.

burg drawing rooms with a taste for romanticist Christianity."[15]

Needless to say, with the accession of Nicholas I, in 1825, the reaction was on with full force. His reign was ushered in with the suppression of the Decembrists, who but a few years before were able to submit plans for a constitutional government to Alexander I.

The effect of the reaction upon the Jew is oft-told history. However, it is necessary to state a few facts. When Nicholas was travelling through Russia in 1816 he observed, as he wrote in his diary, that the Jews were property holders only second in importance to the landed nobility. ". . . They are everything here; merchants, contractors, saloon-keepers, mill-owners, ferry-holders, artisans. . ." From this observation, he deduced, as he also wrote in his diary, ". . .They are regular leeches, and suck these unfortunate governments of White Russia to the point of exhaustion." To this he added, "It is a matter of surprise that in 1812 they displayed exemplary loyalty to us and assisted us wherever they could at the risk of their lives."[16] This and other examples of loyalty are probably overlooked by those writers who maintain that because the Jew is spread over the earth he cannot be a national.

However, those observations, which made of the Jew a leech, were of primary consideration. One of his first steps, on becoming Czar, was an attempt to de-Judaise

[15] Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue, *Spirit of Russia*, p. 84.
[16] Dubnow, Semion, M., *The Jews in Russia and Poland*, II, p. 14.

the Jew. From 1826, when he instructed his ministers to draft a special statute of military service for the Jews until the revolution of the twentieth century, the Jewry of Russia and Poland suffered a century of persecution that might well put to shame any that human ingenuity had hitherto perpetrated.[17]

Era of Reforms Under Alexander II

Russia, like the rest of Europe, was falling under the influence of the constitutionalists during the middle of the century. Young Russia was joining hands with Young Italy and Young Germany. The teachings of Belinski, Herzen, Bakunin, Cernysevski, Dobroljobov and others were being disseminated throughout the empire. These men were grounded in the knowledge obtained from Rousseau, Hegel, Bentham, Feuerbach, Proudhon, Louis Blanc, Mill and Adam Smith.

At this time, also, commerce ceased to be a harmful pursuit. Industrialism was making itself felt in Russia as well as in other countries. Another factor which brought on the era of reforms was the disastrous defeat of the Russians in the Crimean war. Russia realized that a military system without funds to maintain it could not be successful. Thousands upon thousands of soldiers had been living off a land which was on the verge of prostration. Not of small importance was the Jewish manufacturer. The fear of transferring Jews from one place to another under the act of April

[17] *Ibid,* II, pp. 13ff.

20, 1843, still rang in the ears of economists. The act of 1835 creating the pale also was recognized as having depleted the commerce of the rest of Russia. Russia simply wished Jewish enterprise outside of the pale.

As a result of the precarious condition of Russia and the failure of conscription and expulsion, a number of acts were promulgated abolishing juvenile conscription, seizing of cantonists, extending rights of residence all over Russia to Jewish artisans, mechanics, and others.[18] There were some stringent qualifications attached which nullified the good effects of this extension. Privileges entitling some cities to exclude Jews were revoked. Many other laws extending rights and abolishing disabilities were promulgated. Also, fear of the rising revolutionary feeling in Poland caused reform. On May 24, 1862, due to Vyelepolski, acting as mediator between the Russian government and the Poles, a ukase was issued revoking the disability decree of 1808 against the Jews. They were now allowed to acquire immovable property, to settle in prohibited cities, etc.

This healthy condition, however, did not last long. The second half of the reign was again marked with terrorism and restrictions were placed upon the Jews. Due to the Polish insurrection of 1863, in which many Jews took part, the law of 1862, allowing them to acquire land in rural districts, was abolished. An old law prohibiting Jewish forms of dress was revived. As soon as Jewish merchants displayed successful com-

[18] *Ibid,* pp. 154ff.

petition against Russian merchants, because of the partial extension of rights, the Russian merchants demanded that such competition be "curbed." Jews were charged with exploitation, obtaining control of mills, grains, etc. A pogrom broke out in Odessa, the grain center of Russia at this time. The Governor-General of Kiev, Dondakovkorsakov, reported in 1871 that the Jews in the Southwestern provinces of Volhynia, Podolia, and Kiev owned 25 sugar refineries out of 105, and 619 distilleries out of 712, and 5700 mills out of 6353.[19] Similar complaints were heard in other parts of the empire.

Nekhludov and Karpov, members of the committee on the pale, characterized the recent liberalism toward the Jews as an effort to exploit their services. In reference to the taking away of their rights they said, "All the Jewish defects, their separatism and one-sided economical activity, are mere fruits of this oppression. . . . Human reason does not admit of any considerations which might justify the placing of many millions of the Jewish population on a level with criminal offenders."[20]

However, such utterances came too late. Oppression was well on the way. Aside from the above reasons for the reaction there was yet another, more important; that of an intellectual reaction which was growing to combat such libertarians as Herzen, Cernysevski and others. Also, the rising Jewish intelligentsia was reading Darwin, Rousseau and Spencer and organizing

[19] *Ibid,* pp. 184ff.
[20] *Ibid,* pp. 197, 198.

societies for enlightenment, and Jewish papers with such pretentious titles as the *Voskhod* (*The Sunrise*), the *HaMelitz, The Interpreter* and others.

One of the strongest reactionaries was Mihail Nikiforovic Katkov (1816-1887) (55). He was a mere tool of the reaction but nevertheless wielded great influence. In 1845 he was a professor of philosophy, losing his position during the reaction after 1848. In 1856 he founded *"Russkii Vestnik"* (*Russian Messenger*), a liberal paper. Before 1861 he was a liberal. He became antagonistic toward the liberation of the peasants and the ensuing reforms as giving "undue scope to the forces of progress." He now opposed Cernysevski and the realist movement, and his paper became the chief organ of the counter nihilist movement. "Russia needs a unified state and a strong Russian nationality. Let us create such a nationality, upon the foundation of a language common to all the inhabitants, upon a common faith, and upon that of the Slavic mir. Let us overthrow everything which imposes obstacles in the way of these designs."[21]

Much of his attention was directed to the schools. He attacked the reorganization of the universities effected in 1863 and commended the maltreaters of some Moscow students who had accompanied the start of a convoy of exiles.

Not until after Alexander's death in 1881 did he acquire his greatest influence. He denounced the assassination of the Czar as the work of the Poles and

[21] Masaryk, *op. cit.*, p. 194. II.

the intelligentsia. It was mainly his work that created the university statutes of 1884.[22]

Konstantin Petrovic Pobedonascev (1827-1907) was another defender of theocracy. He conceived of a civilization which was the opposite of a western civilization. The old Russian civilization could only be a true basis for a genuine Russian political system. He did not have faith in reason but held as ultimate truth the philosophy of the church fathers. Russia needed the Greek-Orthodox church. The authority of the church and not logic could exist in Russia. The believer does not recognize a foreign doctrine but, "should the need arise he will forcibly impose his own belief on others." Since man is by nature bad then democracy must be evil. Parliamentarianism is "the great lie of our age."[23] "He even regarded the religious fervor of the folk as endowed with something sublimely mysterious."[24] "The state recognizes one creed among all as the true one; it supports and favors one church exclusively."[25] Religion was a means to political ends to Pobedonoscev.[26]

In 1880 he was appointed procurator of the Holy Synod. He held this position until 1905. Being the teacher of Alexander III, he must have had a great influence over him. His program won over that of Minister Louis-Melikov, which had obtained the approval of Alexander II. The imperial manifesto of April 29,

[22] *Ibid,* p. 195, 7.
[23] *Ibid,* p. 200.
[24] *Ibid,* p. 201.
[25] *Ibid,* p. 204.
[26] *Ibid,* pp. 205, 206.

1881, proclaimed that "the Voice of God hath commended us to take up vigorously the reins of government, inspiring us with the belief in the strength and truth of autocratic power, which we are called upon to establish and safeguard." The "Police Constitution" of August 1881 under the name of "The Statute concerning Enforced Public Safety" was promulgated to establish faith and morality and to throttle sedition.[27]

Another influence was Konstantin Nikolaevic Leontev (1831-1891).[28] Although at first a liberal he later accepted orthodoxy and its doctrines unreservedly. He became a pure Byzantine. "The religion of fear, which represents God as the Almighty Jehovah, the wielder of force, is logically and practically carried out on earth by the ruler, the anointed of Jehovah." This ruler must be a true image of the unloving God; he must be God on earth; the absolutist autocracy is the only true Christian state; "despotism was and remains necessary to the organization of society."[29] He worried because of the non-Russian and non-Byzantine frontiers. He held that broken-up Balkania was due to European ideas. Russia should seek religious unification. Though he was not Slavophil consciously, he desired an Asiatic Slavophilism. He sought blind acceptance of Czarism.

Aside from these men there was Vladimir Surgeevic Solovev (1853-1900) who exerted an influence on orthodoxy and unquestioned acceptance of Czarism. Ac-

[27] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, pp. 246ff, II.
[28] Masaryk, T. G., *op. cit.*, p. 207.
[29] *Ibid*, p. 209.

cording to him the church with its doctrines must permeate political and economic society, the state.[30] Unlike other thinkers of his day Solovev held that "true Jewish principles lead to Christianity, just as true Christian principles lead to Judaism."[31] Upon his deathbed Solovev begged his friends to keep him awake, so that he could offer prayers on behalf of the Jews. "It was not the Jews, but the Christians, who created the cult of the golden calf. Cultured Europe, which had become de-Christianized, and had devoted itself to the service of mammon, was here the offender. The Jews were merely consistent in the way they followed the example thus set before them."[32] Notwithstanding such disposition toward the Jews, Solovev's influence had no good effect upon them and merely left them in the position of a foreign, denationalized people. His fundamental thesis assumed "church doctrine to be absolutely true. . .for him, not Jesus and Jesus' teachings, but church doctrine and church dogma, are decisive."[33] Though he found a place for Judaism in a Christian state he overlooked differences of race which he made entirely subordinate to religion and church. He failed to see the historical differences between the Christian and Jewish peoples of Russia. He merely idealized Russian orthodoxy.

The influence that such men must have had on the Jewish problem is obvious. Only in such an atmosphere

[30] *Ibid,* p. 234.
[31] *Ibid,* p. 239.
[32] *Ibid,* p. 239.
[33] *Ibid,* p. 240.

could a Nicholas Pavlovich Ignatyev hold the post of Minister of the Interior.

One of Ignatyev's first acts was to issue a circular characterizing the anti-Jewish excesses that had been going on as being the work of revolutionists who sought to foster resentment against the Jewish mercantile class and also to embarrass the government.[34]

John W. Foster, U. S. Minister to Russia, in a report to the Secretary of State on May 24, 1881 concerning the excesses had the following to say:

"It is asserted also that the Nihilist societies have profited by the situation to incite and encourage the peasants and lower classes of the town and cities in order to increase the embarrassment of the government, but the charge is probably conjectural and not based on very tangible facts."[35]

Ignatyev's lie is obvious when one reads the accounts of the great number of pogroms, too many to mention here. However, it might be well to insert here that so influential an editor as Ivan Aksakov of Moscow attacked the liberals for expressing sympathy for the Jew. The sources to which he went in his attack on the Jew were the medieval church arguments and the modern German anti-Semistism.[36]

Pogroms assumed such proportions that England and America could no longer keep still. Protest meetings were held in these countries. The Earl of Shaftesbury in a speech at a meeting in Mansion House in

[34] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, p. 259.
[35] *Ibid*, p. 260.
[36] *Ibid*, pp. 276ff.

London (February 1, 1882) pointed out that England did not wish to interfere in the inner affairs of Russia but wished to influence those affairs by "moral weapons," "in the name of the principle of 'solidarity of nations.' "[37] Other speeches were made by Cardinal Manning, a Catholic divine, Canon Farrar and Prof. Bryce.

As a result a dispatch appeared in Russian papers dated London, February 9, of which the main tenor was that England did not wish to meddle in Russia's internal affairs but was merely suggesting that her treatment of the Jews was un-Christian, etc.[38]

The United States was more emphatic but accomplished no more than England.[39]

The only effect seems to have been to add a new cause for persecution. Not until after this intervention were the famous "Temporary Rules" of May 3, 1882, forced upon the Jews. Among other effects, these "rules dislodged Jews from nine-tenths of the territory hitherto accessible to them.[40]

Ignatyev had to resign on May 30 and was succeeded by Count Demetrius Tolstoi, who, though a reactionary champion of police power, was at the same time an enemy of all manifestations of mob rule which tended to undermine the authority of the state. Following

[37] *Ibid,* II, pp. 287ff.
[38] *Ibid,* p. 291.
[39] *Ibid,* pp. 297ff. Also House of Representatives, 51*st Congressional Record,* 1*st Session, Exec. Document No.* 470, dated October 1, 1890. Vol. 13, part 7, Appendix, p. 651, *et seq.*
[40] *Ibid,* pp. 309ff.

his orders, there was a marked decrease in the number of pogroms. Only a few pogroms occurred until twenty years later in Kishenev, which proves that they were ordered, or at least sanctioned, by "higher ups."

When the "High commission for Revision of Current Laws Concerning the Jews," formed by an Imperial Ukase of February 4, 1883, and headed by Count Pahlen, brought in its findings after five years of deliberation, it had in its general memoirs the following extracts:

> "Can the attitude of the state toward a population of 5,000,000, forming one-twentieth of its subjects—though belonging to a race different from that of the majority—whom the state itself had incorporated . . . into the Russian body politic, differ from its attitude toward all its other subjects. . . . Without granting him equal rights, we cannot, properly speaking, demand from him civic obligations . . . no less than 650 restrictive laws . . . are such that they have naturally resulted in making until now the life of an enormous majority of the Jews in Russia exceedingly onerous. . . ."[41]

Of course, this did no good either. Pogroms and disabilities continued. The only refuge was emigration. From about this time the doors of the U. S. received thousands of emigrants. With the intensified reaction of 1890 still larger numbers of Jews left the land where their ancestors had lived for hundreds of

[41] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, pp. 363, 364.

years, bringing to the new lands only poverty and ambition. About this time problems of immigration faced the United States for the first time. In President Harrison's address to Congress on December 9, 1891, while deploring the conditions of the Jews and the persecutions by the Russian government, the thought was expressed that such resultant immigration into the United States might be harmful. Emigration from one country necessarily means immigration into another.

Protest meetings were again held in England and America. Nevertheless anti-Semitism continued unabated. One cause of the continued persecutions was the insult the Czar sustained at the hands of the Rothschild's. It is well known that even after the termination of the Russo-German secret treaty of mutual neutrality in 1890, Czar Alexander III remained reluctant to come to terms with Republican France. It happened that at this time Russia was negotiating with the Rothschild's for a loan. When Rothschild heard of the pogroms, the Russian Financial Minister M. Wyshnigrodski was informed that negotiations would be withdrawn unless the pogroms were stopped. The Czar became insulted and negotiations were started with a non-Jewish French House headed by M. Haskier. Incidentally this brought Russia and France closer together and paved the way for the Triple Entente.[42] Another cause for such persecution was found in the closer relationship of the Jewish labor movement, at first purely economic, with the revolutionary movement. In 1897

[42] Wolf, Lucien, *op. cit.*, pp. 54ff.

this movement became known as "The Bund" and later joined the Russian Social Democracy.

The reign of Czar Nicholas II was no less bitter for the Jews. Pobedenoscev remained as head of the Holy Synod and continued to influence the Jewish problem as he had in the past. Durnovo, Minister of the Interior, gave way to Goremykin in 1895. This government wanted to expel all the Jews from the rural districts, but the Minister of Finance, Serge Witte, asked the governments to take over the liquor monopoly, in which the Jews were heavily interested, instead of expelling them. Christian land owners complained about these deportations and asked that the Jewish grain merchants be allowed to reside near railroad stations. Here is but another instance where Jewry was suffered because its presence was necessary to the Christians. Nevertheless, expulsions continued to ruin thousands of Jews.[43]

From Sipyagin's tenure (1899-1902) in the Ministry of the Interior and throughout the following ministries, the pogroms were obviously counter-revolutionary measures.[44] Professor Bogalepov's professional and educational restrictions were openly said by him to be due to the fact that the Jewish students were allied with revolutionary groups. He decreased the norm of Jewish attendance in schools from that established in 1887.[45] (Incidentally, he was shot by a pure Russian.) His successor, for the same reasons, further decreased this norm in all classes of schools.

---

[43] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, p. 27.
[44] *Ibid*, p. 28.
[45] *Ibid*, pp. 336ff.

Jewish petitions to the police to quell pogroms were unavailing from 1897 on. It is quite ironical that the world should have accepted the Czar's invitation to the First International Hague Conference at this time. The increasing fear of the Russian government for the revolutionary parties created more and greater pogroms than had ever been seen before. The Social Democratic and the Social Revolutionary parties had assumed definite shape by this time. The Social Revolutionists finally succeeded in killing Sipyagin on April, 1902. Of course the Jews were blamed for this. As a matter of fact, most of the Jews belonged to the Social Democratic party, while only a few were Social Revolutionists.

With the death of Sipyagin, Plehve became Minister of the Interior. We have mentioned that Pobedonoscev was an ally of Plehve. Maximillian Harden characterized him as follows: "Plehve never looked to anything but himself and his career. Never once, even in a dream, did the idea occur to him of the only serious revolution that seems to be possible in Russia: the rise of the Slav peasantry. . .He out-tyranted the tyrant, ran feverishly from point to point, molested and stirred up Finns, Poles, Armenians and Jews, deprived professors and students, peasants and artisans of their slender right to live. . .He was not a reactionary, but was ambitious. What he really believed no one knew. . ."[46]

Much has been written concerning the measures

[46] Harden, Maximillian, *Monarchs and Man*, p. 179.

that Plehve took to suppress sedition and to exterminate the Jew. Many have written about the Kishenev pogroms, among them Urussov, an assistant governor of the interior and governor of Bessarabia. It is unnecessary to repeat that grewsome story.[47] For our purpose it is necessary, however, to quote what Leo Tolstoi wrote upon hearing of the Kishinev pogrom:

> "My opinion concerning the Kishinev crime is also the result of my religious convictions. . . . I fully realized the horror of what had taken place, and experienced simultaneously a burning feeling of pity for the innocent victims of the cruelty of the populace . . . revulsion at all these so-called cultured people who instigated the mob and sympathized with its actions. But I felt a particular horror for the principal culprit, our government with its clergy which fosters in the people bestial sentiments and fanaticism. . . . The attitude adopted by the Russian Government in relation to this question may only serve as a new proof of the class egotism of this government, which stops at no cruelty whenever it finds it necessary to check movements that are deemed dangerous by it. Like the Turkish government at the time of the Armenian massacres, it remains entirely indifferent to the most horrible acts of cruelty, as long as these acts do not affect its interests."[48]

---

[47] Urussov, Prince Sergiei, D., *Memoirs of a Russian Governor.* Also A. J. Y. B. 5663 (1902-1903).

[48] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, p. 76.

Karabchevsky, a Christian attorney at the trial growing out of the pogrom, upon quitting the court room in disgust, characterized the Kishinev pogrom as the "fulfillment of a criminal order given from above." "His part in the horrible massacre and plunders of the Jews—men, women, and children—at Kishinev caused him (Plehve) to be regarded with abhorrence by the whole world," said Andrew S. White, former ambassador from United States to Russia.

Not only was Plehve the arch-conspirator of the pogroms, but after Kishinev, when self-defense societies were organized, he issued a circular stating that "no self-defense societies should be tolerated." The underlying reason for this order was, of course, the fear that all Jews were considered revolutionists by Plehve, and would create a menace to the government.

Further discussion of Plehve is unnecessary. Suffice it to say that his assassination on July 15, 1904, terminated the most terrible period the Jews had ever witnessed. Incidentally, he was killed by Sazanov, a non-Jewish Russian terrorist.

As a result of the fear put in the heart of the government by the death of Plehve, an imperial manifesto was issued August 11, commemorating the birth of the heir-apparent Alexis, its most important privilege being the abrogation of corporal punishment for peasants and soldiers. Few inconsequential reforms were accorded the Jews.

Svyatapolk-Mirski, who assumed the post left vacant by the death of Plehve, promised justice and kindness. He, though, was powerless to prevent po-

groms. A series of them had already been instituted.[49] In 1905 he endeavored to establish friendly relations with the liberals. But he could not stay the coming revolution. Jews were addressing petitions to the government for equal rights. Organizations of engineers, railroad workers and others were being formed. Strikes were started. The terrorists resorted to killing. Among their victims was the Governor General of Moscow, Grand Duke Sergius, who in 1901 had expelled the Jews. He was also assassinated by a non-Jewish social revolutionist, Kalayev.

Now came the "Black Hundred" against the liberals and Jews to discredit the entire revolution of 1905 as "the work of Jewish hands" and to suppress any form of liberalism. Thousands of anti-Semitic pamphlets were sent out and pogroms were openly organized. There is no similar chapter in the entire history of humanity. Meat taxes, more educational restrictions, and residence restrictions were added to the already large number.

Persecution of the Jews became internationally important at this time, as is seen in the secret correspondence of the Czar with the Emperor William of Germany, and in other official documents, particularly a memorandum on the Jewish question drawn up by Count Lamsdorf in January, 1906. Emperor William in his correspondence to Nicholas convinced him that English intrigue was undermining his empire. Nicholas then concluded with William, at Bjoerkoen,

[49] *Ibid,* pp. 97ff.

on July 23, 1905, the basis of a new triple alliance to consist of Germany, Russia and France. England, Nicholas thought, was aiding the revolutionists, whose leaders he thought were mostly Jews. Count Witte was enraged at the Rothschilds because of his failure to negotiate a loan. It was under these circumstances that Lamsdorf prepared a memorandum proposing that an agreement be reached with Germany providing for the special surveillance of Jewish activities.[50]

In the midst of the excesses a committee under the chairmanship of Bulygin drafted a scheme for a popular assembly.

In the first Duma, which was convened April 24, 1905, and dissolved July 8, pogroms were discussed. Stolypin, who was interpellated regarding the complicity of the Imperial Police Department in instigating the pogroms of 1905, tried to exonerate the authorities. Deputy Urussov, of whom mention has been made, proved by documentary evidence the existence of a secret printing-press in the police department which was issuing proclamations calling upon the people to exterminate the Jews. On July 7, the Duma adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the government, after which it was dissolved.

As a result, revolutionary terrorism was rekindled, giving an excuse for more pogroms. Captain Pyetukhov, of the police, testified at the trial of the chief of Police in Sydelitz, Tikhanovich, that the Jews of

[50] *Secret Documents* published by Russian Revolutionary Government of February, 1918, Vol. VI. Wolf, Lucien, *op. cit.*, pp. 54ff.

Sydelitz had not given the slightest provocation for a pogrom but that it had been started by the police authorities. Tikhanovich was acquitted of the charge.

In the second Duma the question of denominational restrictions was left to the *Committee on the Freedom of Conscience.* After much discussion the committee eliminated all clauses, except those affecting the Jews, from a bill repealing all denominational restrictions. This Duma was soon dissolved.

When Gregovyev, the city-governor of Odessa, reported to the Czar concerning events in Odessa he was amazed to see him wear a badge of the "League of Russian People." Similar badges were worn by known pogromists in Odessa.

The Third Duma (the Black Duma) succeeded in passing the following: "No one shall be limited in the right of choosing his place of residence and in moving from place to place, except in the cases set forth in the law, and excepting the Jews who arrive in localities situated outside the pale of settlement."

In 1910 the government again expelled a large number of Jews. In 1911 the Beilis case attracted world wide attention. Not until 1913 was Beilis acquitted and the real culprits found to be the Black Hundred. In 1914, twenty-five lawyers who had taken part in the Beilis case were found guilty of "having agitated against against the government." Not until the war, when Russian statesman feared that Poland might join the central powers, was there a relaxation of government anti-Semitism.

POLAND

There is perhaps no clearer example of the thesis of this dissertation than the history of the Jews in Poland.

Throughout the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Poland was the sanctuary for persecuted Jewry from the whole of Europe.

Such sanctuary was possible for a number of reasons. Situated between orthodox Russia and the Catholic west, Poland remained pagan longer than any other European state, hesitating to accept the conflicting civilizations of either. Isolated from the east by Russia, who looked longingly to Constantinople, and from the west by the German princes who sought to inherit the Roman Empire, Poland was able to attain a degree of civilization, culture and prosperity such as no other country of Europe possessed.

A large factor in her success were the Jews, who comprised the mercantile or middle class. Whether due to the mercantile connections which the Jews had with the rest of Europe or the inability of the Poles, the Jews became the most important class of Poland, the class which stood between the Polish serfs and the noble landowners. Many of the Jews were farmers of revenues. Coins of the day bore Hebrew inscriptions upon them. Jewry waxed prosperously and happily in Poland until the beginning of the twelfth century when the German merchants came from the west. Ever ready to benefit from the trade relations of the Jews and the Germans, the Polish princes invited both

to Poland and conferred special privileges upon them. The influx of German merchants and, necessarily, Catholicism, created friction between the Germans and the Jews. However, Poland recognized Jewry for its worth and in 1264, Prince Boleslaw granted them privileges and special protection. Kasimir the Great (1333-1370) held them in such great esteem that beside granting them complete liberty he allowed them to govern themselves.

By the time Catholicism made some appreciable impress upon Poland a new situation arose which made it possible for the Jews, like other dissenters, to live in peace. In the fifteenth century the Polish-Lithuanian state was constituted. Here two states of nearly equal power combined. One was Catholic and the other, Lithuania, was orthodox. A state so constituted must of necessity be tolerant to both integral parts. Further, each church organization must of necessity be careful and judicious in its methods if it wishes to gain the ascendency over the other. Reconstituted Europe after the Peace of Westphalia is an example of the comparative tolerance arising from the division of the Catholic Church, a division which, subsequently allowed many heretic sects to live and thrive. Political science points to the equally divided two party system as being more desirable in a state than a too influential party with but small parties to contest its rule. We submit then that the dual religion of the Polish-Lithuanian state allowed the existence of heretic sects. Yet another cause for the existence of the Polish haven for Jewry was the external political situation of Poland.

By the fifteenth century Poland was being harassed by the Swedes, Russians and Germans. Intrigues on the part of these states were beginning to corrupt and weaken Poland. Poland was not unaware of the purposes of her neighbors and as a result distrusted them and their civilizations.

The above reasons for the existence of tolerance in Poland seem to us to be indisputable. It is incontrovertible that Jewry witnessed no greater or better period of safety and of tolerance than during these centuries in Poland.

Not until wholesale expulsion of Jews from other lands brought thousands of broken, poverty-stricken Jews into Poland did she, attacked, weakened, and poor herself, begin to see in the Jews a serious problem. Rich Jews were always allowed residence in Christian Europe. Only poor Jews were chased from one land to another. Rich Jews could pay for protection, poor Jews could not. The poor, fearful Jews, when they came to Poland, of course, gathered in Jewish centers. (Gregariousness is no less a psychological part of Jewry than of any other people.) Further, distrustful of their Christian neighbors, superstitious as any poor folk must be, the new arrivals were wary of any innovations or of any efforts to draw them into the world. Efforts to Polanize them could only seem to be efforts to de-Judaize them.

With all the Jewish distrust, for political innovations, and fear of loss of Talmudic orthodoxy and custom, Jewry, in the course of social evolution, would have entered Polish life and become part and parcel of her

culture and progress just as Jewry has done in other countries. Left free of western and Russian civilization to work out her own destiny, Poland might have remained "Paradisus Judaeorum."

The barrier to Jewish emancipation that arose, was the nationalistic tendencies of rising statehood. For a long time, as we have shown, Poland was being harassed by her neighbors, whose purpose it was to extend their dominion over her. For a long time those neighbors were conniving at her downfall, succeeding in taking parts of her away, throwing her into revolution, and pauperizing her into a state of exhaustion. Finally in 1772 the three powers, Prussia, Russia and Austria accomplished the first partition. In a letter to Prince Henry, Frederick the Great said of the partition that they were about to "communicate and partake of the eucharistic body of Poland."[51]

Even while she was losing her ethnic consciousness, Poland sought to advance Jewish enfranchisement in connection with the general reform of the Permanent Council and the Quadrennial Diet from 1788 to 1791. Reforms at this time however, were met with such opposition from her three despoilers that in 1795 she was entirely dismembered, the powers dividing her among themselves. From now on Polish Jewry was in the hands of the three partitioning powers.

These powers proceeded to treat Poland with a policy which was then already in favor; that of national consciousness superinduced by needs of statehood. This

[51] Sarolea, Charles, *Letters on Polish Affairs*, first letter.

nationalistic policy was simply the molding of Polish culture and ideals into those of the three powers. Such a policy, consciously sought, must be coercive, as minority groups are likewise possessed of a consciousness of solidarity and are combative of the culture and ideals that the majority group urges it to accept. It is only through an unconscious, slow, evolutionary process that a dominant group can impose its mind processes upon the mind of another, and then, of course, intermarriage must be part of that process.

In Poland, the process was of a conscious, coercive nature to forestall any possible rejuvenation of ethnic Poland. The strong consciousness of the Polish mind necessitated active measures. The three powers thus proceeded to wipe out any semblance of Polish consciousness. No more would a Kosciuszko rally Poland to defend its constitution. Poland must be mutilated beyond recovery.

One way of keeping Poland dead was to create internal dissension in it. The Jews in Poland and Lithuania in 1788 numbered approximately 617,000. The "Jewish Commission" appointed by the Quadrennial Diet found that the Jews comprised one-eighth of a population of 8,790,000. Chatzki said there were about 900,000. Although approximately one-eighth of the population, the Jews controlled most of the export trade, one-half of the total number of artisans, most of the Arendars (managers of the large estates) etc.[52] In a word, the minority controlled most of the material

[52] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, I, p. 262ff.

wealth of the country. In connection with the Arendars it might be mentioned, that, in their scope of employment they were forced to exercise the will of the employer in all cases. When that will worked hardship on the peasants, the Jews, being in personal contact with them, suffered the blame. With such an ignominious calling forced upon them, they must, of course, have made the peasants antipathetic toward them.

These factors, together with the traditional anti-Semitism must necessarily have formed a foundation upon which internal dissension might be based.

"Whatever their differences and jealousies, the statesmen of those three powers were one and united in their joint hatred of Pole and Jew. . .they had no intention of permitting anything resembling a common cause, anything like a fellowship in suffering to grow up between the two. . .There were to be no more Boreks and no more Jewish regiments rallying to the call of another possible Kosciuszko. . .The surest way to forestall any such contingency as that was by setting Jew and Pole against each other. . . The entire history of the Jew in Poland from this time on is a development of this combined anti-Polish and anti-Jewish policy of the powers, the policy of "divide and rule."[53]

One of the first moves was to drive the poorest and most ignorant Jews into Russian Poland, making it a "dumping-ground." Germany proceeded to drive them entirely from her territory into the "Pale." Only those

[53] Phillips, Charles, *The New Poland*, Ch. XXI, Sec. 3.

possessing 1,000 thalers were allowed to remain in Germany. "Being the poorest, these exiles also were in the greatest misery, as well as in the greatest ignorance. Poverty and ignorance together made them ready prey of their enemies, who were neither slow in inflaming their unenlightened minds with suspicions and fear of the Poles, nor backward in making anti-Polish sentiment a paying commodity."[54] By virtue of the similarity of the Jewish and German languages together with the hatred of the Pole for the Germans another excuse for antipathy prevailed.

Yet, the three powers did not succeed at once. Libertarianism had made its way into Poland. An effort toward Jewish enfranchisement was made in 1791. In the Duchy of Warsaw in 1807 a similar effort was made. From this date until the Industrial Revolution, about 1847, we see nothing further done. At that time the Pozanian Provincial Parliament sought to effect Jewish reforms.

Following 1815 the problem was affected by the reaction. The first article of the final act of the Congress of Vienna declared: "The Poles, subjects respectively, of Russia, Austria and Prussia will obtain national representation and national institutions." Russia undertook to preserve separately and autonomously the kingdom of Poland, which was to enjoy her own laws, language and constitution. All this was disregarded. France and England only sent notes of mild remonstrance to Russia upon the occasion of an uprising of

[54] *Ibid.*

Poles in 1831 and 1863 and to Austria when the Republic of Cracow was suppressed in 1846.[55] Russia took Kelm from Poland even though the territorial integrity of Poland was entrusted to her. In 1815, in that part of Poland held by Germany, Jews comprised six and three-tenths per cent of the population. Due to the expulsion that per cent dropped to four and three-tenths in 1857 and to one per cent in 1910.[56] In the Duchy of Warsaw, annexed by Russia in 1815, the Jews still retained some freedom due to the constitution which Russia allowed Poland in 1815. After the insurrection of 1830, Russia attained greater dominion over Poland and withdrew what autonomy had been given her. Such withdrawal, of course, left Jewry wholly in the hands of Russia.

The Jewish problem can be seen arising even before Polish autonomy was taken away. A committee, to consider the Jewish and agrarian problem, under Count Adam Czartoryski found that the Jews should give up their liquor trade and engage in agriculture; give up their Kahals (communal autonomy); substitute the Polish language for their own. Then they would receive full enfranchisement. Soon afterwards the Polish viceroy Zayonchek, formerly a comrade of Kosciuszko, but now a reactionary currying favor with Russia, wrote in his report to Alexander I, on March 8, 1816, that the Jews were a menace to Poland, were cheats, were multiplying rapidly, and were ex-

[55] *Ibid*, Sec. 4.
[56] Gibbons, *Reconstruction of Poland and the Near East*, pp. 3ff.

treme separatists. In the same year, 1816, Nicholas Novosiltzev, Imperial Commissioner attached to the Provincial Government in Warsaw, who was opposed to the Pole, suggested immediate enfranchisement of the Jew in Poland, based upon some so-called reforms.[57]

Here we see Poland torn between different policies regarding the Jews. The upshot of it all was the revival of the ghetto; a greater Jewish separatism. In Warsaw certain streets were closed to the Jews. Jews who had settled in certain districts were expelled. A law passed in 1823 barred Jews from nearly 100 towns within 21 versts from the frontiers of Austria and Prussia. Jewish visitors to the capitol were forced to pay a tax.[58] As elsewhere, pamphlets and magazine articles appeared holding the Jews responsible for the decline of Poland and demanding that they be forced to leave. Ritual murder accusations were revived. Papers appeared showing evil in the rabbis and kahals. By 1821 such accusations resulted in the abolition of the kahals.[59] Even though they played an important part in the insurrection of 1830, the condition of the Jews became worse and worse as the seeds sown by the great powers blossomed.

Ostrovski wrote of their valor during the Polish insurrection:

> "This spectacle could not fail to make your heart ache. Our conscience bade us to attend to the betterment of this most down-trodden part

[57] Dubnow, S. M., *op. cit.*, II, pp. 88ff.
[58] *Ibid*, pp. 93ff.
[59] *Ibid*, pp. 101, 102.

of our population at the earliest possible moment."[60]

The Polish historian, Lelevel, wrote in 1832 that the Jews "would forget the insults of present-day Poland for the sake of the sweet reminiscences of the Polish republic in days gone by."[61] Adam Mickiewicz, the famous Polish poet, made similar utterances.

From this period down to the World War the history of Policy Jewry is similar to that of Jewry in Germany, Austria and particularly Russia.

Since 1848, Germany and Russia have displayed complete solidarity in their treatment of the Poles. "Poland is dead; she must never be resuscitated." From 1865, Polish proprietors in Ruthenia and Lithuania were compelled to pay into the Russian treasury a surtax of 10 per cent on incomes. Poland with only one-fifteenth of the population had in recent years been forced to pay nearly one-fourth of the entire revenue of the Russian Empire. In proportion to population and area, Russian Poland had fewer railroads than any other country in Europe. It was the only country where public primary education declined in the last four hundred years. In 1500 there was one school for every 2250 children, while in 1912 there was one school for every 2750 children. In 1906, one thousand schools closed. In Germany the disabilities placed upon the Poles also assumed great proportions.[62]

---

[60] *Ibid*, pp. 106, 107.
[61] *Ibid.*
[62] Gibbons, *op. cit.*, pp. 3ff.

The following figures show what proportion of the Polish population was Jewish and as such affected by the policy to "Keep Poland Dead."

By 1772 there were about 450,000 Jews.
By 1792 the number doubled.
By 1824 they constituted 9.3 per cent of the total.
By 1834 they constituted 10.1 per cent of the total.
By 1862 they constituted 12.8 per cent of the total.
By 1890 they constituted 13.9 per cent of the total.
By 1905 they constituted 14.5 per cent of the total.
By 1914 they constituted 15 per cent of the total, or one-half of the total number of Jews in the world.[63] The increase from 1862 is significant, since from the period 1862 to 1890 and continuing down to the war, thousands of Jews emigrated to other countries, particularly the United States. Notwithstanding the emigration of nearly 50,000 per year to the United States and 10,000 elsewhere from 1897 to 1911 the Jewish population increased in Poland, due, of course to immigration from Russia and Germany. Much has been said about Russian expulsions into the Pale. One instance of German expulsion is seen in that of March, 1885, when the Prussian Government banished all Jews who had not been born in Prussia. Because of their poor condition, most of these Jews had to go to neighboring Poland. Thus, from both sides the Jewish flood swamped the land of the Poles.[64]

What effect must such a policy have had upon the country? We must remember:

[63] Phillips, C., *op. cit.*, Ch. XXI, Sec. IV.
[64] *Ibid.*

1st—The seeds of antipathy sown by history.

2nd—Jewish separatism and fear as a result of such history.

3rd—Jewish aptitude along particular lines due to experience, such experience being forced upon them.

4th—National consciousness of the Polish people.

5th—Policies of that nationalistic consciousness as affecting group minorities, particularly, as we are concerned with, the Jews.

The effect could not be other than bad. By 1912 there were cooperative consumers' associations in Poland. Until 1905 such organizations were forbidden. With the revolution and the subsequent feeble attempts at reform, Poland took courage, and urged by her National Democrats took a step toward organization and a revival of national consciousness. The economic progress of Jews in the two industrial centers of Russian Poland, Warsaw and Lodz, gave rise to the boycott agitation. Russian and Pole joined hands against the Jews. In the hands of the National Democrats the Cooperative Consumers' Association served merely as a boycott of the Jews, particularly after 1912, when the Jews had thrown their support to a Social Democrat instead of to M. Dmowski, a National Democrat and a known anti-Semite.

From this time on the problem assumed a purely economic aspect. There can be but little doubt that the anti-Semitic feeling aroused by the National Dem-

ocratic party and precipitated by the Russian Government, even down to the second decade of the twentieth century, was due to the efforts of Poland to get rid of its most valuable mercantile class, the Jews.

BALKANIA

The intense nationalism of the small states in eastern Europe, and the rivalry between Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism for influence there, have been the basic causes of anti-Semitism.

Russia has ever been covetous of Constantinople. Only through the Balkans could she hope to approach her. Germany, through Austria-Hungary, hoped to link up Deutschtum with the Aegean Sea and with the Bagdad Railway, and thence with the Asiatic world. Thus, both of these countries sought influence in eastern Europe; Russia through her Slavic relationship with the Balkans and Germany through the political position of her closely related Germanic Austria.

It is unnecessary to repeat the history of the Balkans, here. Suffice it to say, the two largest powers of continental Europe were able to keep stirred up, by their secret diplomacy, the jealous, petty Balkan states. Movements for a larger Bulgaria, a larger Roumania are well-known history. Irridentist movements are equally well-known. National unification and aggrandisement have constituted, as they do today, the keynote of Balkan politics.

The effect of such a policy upon the Jews can be

easily conjectured. Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism could be trusted to supplement the Balkan methods of persecution. The same libels, pogroms, similar expulsions, as degrading disabilities, the 'numerus clausus,'—all were heaped upon the Jews.

Of the various Balkan states, Roumania commands most of our attention, as there, the problem assumes greatest proportions.

For our purpose it is necessary to set forth a few facts from a period just prior to the Congress of Berlin of 1878.[65]

Article VI of a rough draft of the Roumanian constitution of 1866 states that, "religion is no obstacle to naturalization." It adds, "With regard to the Jews, a special law will regulate their admission to naturalization and thus also to civil rights." Following attacks upon the Jews, Article VI was withdrawn and Article VII, which states that "aliens of the Christian persuasion alone can obtain naturalization," was put to a vote. At this time John Bratianu was at the head of the government. He brought to light old circulars that had been used against the Jews, resulting in rioting, and expulsions. This brought remonstrances from Europe, particularly France and England and also from America. In 1866 and 1869 Cremieux, one of the founders of the *Israelite Universelle,* visited Roumania to investigate conditions. In 1867 Sir Moses

[65] Schwarzfeld, Dr. E., *American Jewish Year Book* (1901-1905), pp. 22ff; pp. 63ff. Also Kohler, Max J., and Wolf, Lucien, "Jewish Disabilities in the Balkan States," *American Jewish Historical Society, No.* 24, pp. 1ff.

Montefiore appealed to the Roumanian Government on behalf of the Jews. England at the instance of Sir Francis Goldsmid made representations to Roumania. Secretary William H. Seward for the United States made representation through Minister Morris at Constantinople concerning Roumanian and Serbian Jewish persecutions.[66] As a result Bratianu was dismissed. The next ministry was no better. Soon after, some of the powers made commercial treaties with Roumania, even though there were restrictions against Jewish traders coming into Roumania from those other countries. By the time of the Russo-Turkish War, Bratianu was back in power.

After the outbreaks of anti-Semitism in 1870, the United States again remonstrated with Roumania, to no avail. In order to be better informed of conditions, Benjamin F. Peixotto was made American Consul at Bucharest.

To show what external influence had to do with the problem it is necessary to cite here but one of many instances.

Less than a year after Peixotto's arrival at Bucharest, on June 5, 1872, the church at Ismail was robbed by Silberman, an apostate Jew. He was tortured and, as a result, implicated a number of Jews. Soon the Jews of Ismail were attacked by the people. Through Peixotto's influence one Jew was released and another, the Rabbi Brandeis, was released on the intervention of the Austrian Consul-General as an Austrian sub-

[66] *Foreign Relations of United States*, 1867, II, 2, 3, 9.

ject. The rioters were then arrested, and the Government ordered all the Jews to trial. Although Silberman exonerated them they were found guilty, and the rioters were acquitted. A manuscript, written at the time, indicated that the whole crime and its outcome was the result of Russian intrigue for the purpose of injuring the Jews and the administration of Prince Charles.[67] Every foreign consul, except the Russian, signed a protest to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

While persecutions were not abated to any large extent, Peixotto's influence caused the removal of many hostile officials and prevented some new restrictions against the Jews.

At this time the First International Jewish Conference met at Brussels in 1872. The most important discussions were on emigration from persecuted lands. Wholesale emigration was found to be impractical, as most of the Jews were paupers. The assemblage of a conference of powers at Constantinople led to the Second International Jewish Conference in 1876. This resulted in an appeal to the conference of powers for protection and equal civil and political rights for all non-Mohammedans in the Ottoman Empire and for emancipation of the Jews in the Balkans. It is necessary to say here that Turkey did not harass the Jews, but that the words "Ottoman Empire" refer to those Slavic States which were under the sovereignty of Turkey. However, Russia and Turkey were soon at war and nothing was done. The Third International Jewish Conference at Paris in 1878 again discussed

[67] Kohler, Max J., and Wolf, Lucien, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 15.

emigration and warned against indiscriminate emigration of Jewish paupers.

The Congress of Berlin in 1878 finally accomplished what remonstrance, notes and conferences could not. It conferred absolute civil and political rights on the Jews in the Balkans.

John A. Kasson, United States Minister to Austria, suggested to Secretary Evarts that the United States should approve the granting of equal rights to Jews in Roumania.[68]

When Serbia was discussed Prince Gortschakoff wanted religious liberty in Serbia to be as meager as in Russia, but a refusal of civil and political rights.

Germany, Italy, Austria, Turkey and England declared themselves for religious liberty and equal rights. Complete freedom was finally accorded the Jews in Bulgaria and Montenegro.

When the Roumanian question was brought before the Congress, Bratianu, already in disfavor because of the loss of Bessarabia, tried to evade the Jewish problem, but the Congress was unanimous in not granting Roumania her independence except on the acceptance of conditions imposed on Serbia. Roumania, of course, accepted the conditions. The final text of the treaty read:

> *Article XLIII.* The high contracting parties recognize the independence of Roumania, subject to conditions set forth in the following articles.
>
> *Article XLIV.* In Roumania the difference of

[68] *Foreign Relation,* 1878, p. 42.

creeds and confessions shall not be alleged against any person as a ground for exclusion or incapacity in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil and political rights, admission to public employments, functions, and honors, or the exercise of the various professions and industries in any locality whatsoever. The freedom and outward exercise of all foreigners, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchical organization of the different communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs. The subjects and citizens of all the powers, traders, or others, shall be treated in Roumania, without distinction of creed, on a footing of perfect equality.[69]

Of the states affected by the treaty, Roumania was the only one to disregard her pact and find a loophole to continue her persecutions.

Since Article VII of the Roumanian Constitution of 1866 provided that "aliens of the Christian persuasion alone can obtain naturalization," Roumania had to revise it to satisfy Article XLIV of the Congress of Berlin, which did away with religious, political and civil disabilities. In order to further withhold citizenship Jews were now considered "aliens not subject to alien protection." This at once made every Jew in Roumania an alien, subject to every caprice of the government. Article VII, in its modified form, accorded naturalization only to individuals by vote of the two chambers. Traffic in selling citizenship began. In decrying this practice Kogalichanu said that

[69] Kohler, Max J., and Wolf, Lucien, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 70.

"the Jews had not eaten Roumania, but her representatives had eaten many a Jewish purse." Laws were made to cut support from the Jews. "Do not buy a pin from the Jews" became the cry. Beginning with 1880, Jews were restricted in education and residence, excluded from certain occupations and office holding, and denied naturalization.[70] Expulsions and pogroms were revived. The only refuge was emigration.[71]

The published journal of King Charles, *Aus Den Leben Konig Karls Von Rumanien,* reveals that Jewish emancipation aroused no such opposition in Serbia.[72] A letter of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria to Charles of Roumania dated August 10, 1879,[73] says: "While I have been an enemy of the Berlin Treaty . . . I have shaped my mission in the most pronouncedly European spirit possible, and require equal rights to be accorded to all." A transcript of a letter from the Emperor of Germany under date of July 25, 1879,[74] shows his attitude towards the Jews and the Congress of Berlin. He says: "With regard to Roumania, I have, you know, from the outset most strongly disapproved of the resolution of the Congress concerning the Jewish question, though only after the blow had fallen, since I was not then at the helm. Since then I have of course only had to support the strict execution of the resolutions of the Congress, but I have

[70] Schwarzfeld, Dr. E., *op. cit.*, pp. 71ff.
[71] Hermalin, D. M., "Roumanian Jews in America," *American Jewish Year Book* (1901-1902).
[72] *American Jewish Historical Society,* No. 25, pp. 74ff.
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] *Ibid.*

demanded at every opportunity that no pressure be used in the matter." Elsewhere, Prince Karl Anton informed his son, King Charles, that the Emperor told him that had he not been suffering from his wounds during the Berlin Congress he would never have consented to the extension of Jewish rights. Prince Anton added that Bismarck did not consult the Emperor in the matter, or at least did not report to him fully.[75]

While the existence of the Jews was being made more onerous and precarious in Roumania, that of the Jews in Bulgaria, Montenegro, and Serbia was becoming better, due in a large measure to the fact that very few, proportionately, lived there.

The year 1902 again called for intervention by Secretary John Hay, following the increased immigration into the United States of persecuted Roumanian Jews.[76] In 1912 and 1913 more attempts at intervention were made.

The Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913 created new problems.[77] The war waged by Montenegro, Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria against Turkey brought 130,000 Jews, who had lived under the tolerant Turkish regime for centuries, under the sway of the Balkan States. The subsequent war of Greece, Serbia, and Roumania against Bulgaria again changed the home and fortune of the Jews. When the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in August, 1913, Roumania received Silistria,

---

[75] *Ibid,* p. 224.
[76] Joseph, Samuel, *Jewish Immigration,* pp. 91ff.
[77] *A. J. Y. B.* (1913-1914), Article on "Balkan Wars and the Jews."

which contained a large Jewish population, Serbia, about 40,000 Jews, including those in Bulgarian lands, and Greece received about 80,000 Jews.[78]

In the war against Turkey, the Greeks occupied a Jewish center, Salonica, and in the second war took cities containing large Jewish communities from the Bulgars.

Before the war, Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria had 60,000 Jews. After it they had 180,000. Before the war, Serbia had about 7,000. This increased to about 17,000. About 45,000 in Bulgaria increased to 75,000. Greece's Jewish population sprang from 11,000 to about 85,000.[79]

The outlook for these Jews was indeed gloomy. Subject to persecution, pillage, ravishing and murder, as Jewry has always been in European war areas, they constituted a sad so-called racial minority group. Tradition did surely not make them more desirable. From this time immigration into the United States from the Levantine took a spurt. Aside from the Balkan wars, the revolution of the Young Turks in 1908, the Turko-Italian wars, and other factors caused increase in emigration.

FRANCE

The first stage of the French revolution was carried out under the influence of the conception of natural

[78] *Ibid.*
[79] *Ibid.*

rights of man, as conferring upon him freedom of speech, occupation, equality before the law, and free exercise of religious belief. After the establishment of the republic, however, political thought changed. ". . .those who preferred a monarchy logically ceased to be Frenchmen. . ."[80] The change in political psychology was caused by the national consciousness of the people. The new-found liberty caused the people to entrench themselves against any real or imagined enemy. The various coalitions against France consolidated the people against the foreign nations, which regarded the struggle of Louis XVI as their own. Within, the former peasants, but now land-owners, realized the precariousness of their position as a result of the 'terrorists.' The taking away of religion was something the masses could not understand. As a result, a reaction took place. The terrorists were sent to the guillotine, Christianity was re-established, and the framing of a new constitution was begun.[81]

At this time, news of French reverses were coming into France. The 'Directory,' which was accused of ridding itself of Napoleon by sending him to Egypt now came into disfavor. Napoleon, receiving news of the turbulent times at home set sail for France where he overthrew the 'Directory' and organized the consulate of which he was a member.[82]

With the reins of the government in the hands of

---

[80] Dunning, W. A., *op. cit.*, Ch. VIII.
[81] Esmein, Jean Paul, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, pp. 849ff Vol. X.
[82] Rose, John Holland, *op. cit.*, pp. 195, 196. Vol. XIX.

Napoleon, unity of command was realized. Libertarianism, free choice of individuals was found wanting, in practice. The landed peasantry, as has been said, underwent a change of psychology, of outlook on life. National consciousness was aroused. A reaction, of necessity, followed.

The Jews who had been emancipated became again the objects of disabilities. Here, as in other countries, history had taught the people to hate the Jews. Also, as in other countries, centuries of oppression had forced them into ignoble callings. The theories of the German philosophers had been spread in France. Aside from this the Catholics worked against the Jews. Luckily for the Jews the Catholics for the most part wished the monarchy back, thus being themselves the objects of distrust. The old arguments against the Jews were revived. However, after much deliberation and assemblies of rabbis and the Synhedrin, Napoleon accorded rights to the Jews in France, and his dependencies did likewise, for the most part.[83]

With the downfall of Napoleon the downfall of the Jews took place.[84] In France, the Bourbons and the Catholic clergy were reinstated. Absolutism again arose to challenge freedom. Old vested interests came back with their intolerance. Those German cities which Napoleon had taken now undid as much of his work as they could. Persecutions in those cities started anew. Pius VII introduced the inquisition throughout

---

[83] Graetz, H., *op. cit.*, pp. 474ff. V. V.
[84] *Ibid*, pp. 510ff.

France and ordered that Jews forfeit the freedom they had obtained.

As in other countries, many writers took up the cry against the Jews. The pseudo-scientific literature which made of the Jew an inferior person was widely read. Edouard Lassen (1800-1876) was one of the first who asserted that the Jews were inferior, and he contrasted their exclusiveness and sharpness to "the harmony of psychical forces which distinguishes the Aryan." Ernest Renan in his *Studies of Religious History,* insisted that the Semitic race did not comprehend civilization in the modern sense; that they "bequeathed their bigotry to the Aryans, who were naturally broader." "There can be little doubt that Renan's views had marked influence upon the growth of a hostile anti-Semitic spirit." "The extensive literature of anti-Semitism shows throughout Renan's unconscious coloring."[85]

DeBonald and DeMaistre also aided the intellectual support for the reactionary measures of Metternich. The monarchic principle, DeMaistre insists, is "dominant in both State and Church." "This monarchy is indispensable to the existence of the state, and infallibility is the attribute of the Pope precisely as sovereignty is the attribute of the secular prince."[86]

The climax of the movement was the Damascus affair in 1840. In the winter of that year a superior and a servant disappeared from a monastery. Since this took place before Passover the Jews were accused of

[85] Isaacs, Abram S., "Jews and Judaism," *Americana,* p. 28.
[86] Dunning, W. A., *op cit.,* p. 191.

ritual murder, many being killed and plundered as a result. The accusations did not come from the natives but through the French consul at Damascus. The Catholics, who were under the protection of France, saw fit to accuse the Jews. Thiers, who was at this time inviting the advances of the Jesuits in order to gain strength for French lands in the Orient, did nothing to stop the murder and plunder. Not until Adolphe Cremieux and Moses Montefiore went to Egypt and convinced those in power that the Jews were innocent did the affair end.[87]

The next wave of anti-Semitism in France came with the influence of Treitschke and other German professors.[88] The Jews were seen as the liberal mercantile class. The Jesuits and others, who were trying to restore the monarchy, exerted their influence along anti-Semitic lines. The Faubourg St. Germain had been induced to entrust its capital to the *Union Generale,* which was to replace the Rothschilds as the repository of Catholic funds. Later the Union failed, impoverishing many of the aristocracy. As a result the Jews were blamed.[89] At the same time the Jesuits were trying to obtain a monopoly of French officers' messes as a step toward monarchical restoration, and they advocated the dismissal of Jews. One of the leaders of this anti-Semitic movement was Edouard Drumont, whose book *"La France Juive"* (Jewish

[87] Graetz, H., *op. cit.,* pp. 632ff.
[88] Lazare, B., *Anti-Semitism,* pp. 220ff.
[89] Wolf, Lucien, *Encyc. Brit.,* pp. 142ff, VIII.

France), 1886, did much to bring about the well-known Dreyfus affair a few years later.[90]

The Dreyfus affair, a result of Jesuit aims to gain and maintain political recognition, and of the monarchical party, was the last important expression of anti-Semitism in France. The Jesuits resorted to the old myth of the conniving and dishonest Jew. The unfortunate Dreyfus was chosen as an example of Jewish infidelity to France. Not until the confession and suicide of Colonel Henry, was Dreyfus released from jail and the whole affair proved a plot to discredit the Jews.[91]

After the death of Emile Zola, who had bitterly opposed the conspirators of the Dreyfus affair, slanders were revived somewhat. The Humbert swindle, negotiations for the Panama Canal, served as a pretext for aspersions on Jewish honesty and patriotism.[92]

Aside from these later efforts to discredit them, French Jews were as unmolested as English or American Jewry.

GREAT BRITAIN

Much need not be said of the Jewish problem in Great Britain up to 1914. The early history of the Jews in Great Britain is similar to that of the Jews in

[90] *Ibid.*

[91] Raisin, Max, *History of the Jews in Modern Times*, pp. 65ff.

[92] Wolf, Lucien, *op. cit.*, pp. 142ff. VIII.

other countries. In 1290 Edward I banished the Jews from England. Not until the Commonwealth of Cromwell, in the 17th century, were they allowed to take up residence there. This right was accorded the Jews only after they had gained prominence in several of the colonies. We have already spoken of England's intervention on behalf of the Jews as early as 1744.[93]

However, the French Revolution had the effect on Great Britain that it had on other monarchic powers. Everything French was looked upon with suspicion. In order to safeguard herself from Frenchmen and their influence, England resorted to anti-alien legislation. Since the Jews were still considered as such they suffered in common with other aliens. Together with these, many Jews were also expelled. Though a few Jews were accorded citizenship up until 1830, they were excluded from Parliament, from high rank in the army and navy, from Oxford, from degrees, fellowships, and numerous other advantages. They were even barred from exercising the ballot at preliminary elections if election officials saw fit. This state of affairs existed until about 1830.

From 1830 until 1866 a series of bills were passed which culminated in the complete enfranchisement of the Jew. A Jew could now take a seat in Parliament without the embarrassment of an oath of abjuration. Jews were now even admitted to the peerage.

From this time on Jewry lived quite peacefully in Great Britain, with only occasional outbreaks of anti-

[93] *Supra*, pp. 18ff.

Semitic feeling. Such outbreaks were due not to English Jews, but to the arrival of poor immigrants from Russia and Roumania.

The *British Brothers' League* of London, founded in 1901, aimed to induce Parliament to restrict such immigration. A commission, appointed by the King on March 21, met on April 24th to inquire into the question. It found that restrictive measures based on unfitness would exclude only a negligible number of Jews. At the second meeting April 28th, Arnold White, an agitator, said that the poor condition of the people was due to the Jews. Small manufacturers revealed that their business interests were being hurt by the influx of foreigners.[94]

An unsavory incident, just shortly before the war, revived anti-Semitism. During the Marconi agitation, a judge in passing sentence in a libel suit charged Cecil Chesterton and others with being anti-Semitic. Premier Asquith, in absolving Sir Rufas Isaacs, Sir Herbert Samuel, and David Lloyd George of imputed misconduct, said in Parliament: "There is another element in the case to which I feel bound to call attention, because it is also new in our political life. No one who has followed the history of their transactions can be blind to the fact that the most disgraceful appeals were made from the beginning to racial and religious animosity."[95]

The few examples of anti-Semitism are enough to show that what disabilities existed in Great Britain

[94] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1901-1902, Sec. on England.
[95] *Ibid.*

were due, not to religious differences as such, but to nationalism.

When the existence of the Jews was necessary to the material enhancement of a locality, they were left unmolested and accorded rights. When their successes came in conflict with the English merchants, efforts at expulsion, disabilities, and persecutions arose. Only then were they considered foreigners, unsocial, and incapable of enfranchisement. In short, disabilities were due to that group consciousness which seeks self-advancement and sees an obstacle to that advancement in the form of any group which is divergent in any appreciable way.

CHAPTER V

THE JEWS SINCE 1914

When the World War broke out, one-half of the Jewish population of the world lived in eastern Europe. Russian Poland, where over 2,000,000 Jews lived, was in a salient. Another million Jews lived in Galicia, a frontier of Austria. Behind Russian Poland were the fifteen Russian provinces, that contained another 4,000,000 Jews. Behind these 7,000,000 Jews was Russia, closed to them by the domiciliary restrictions. In front were hostile Germany and Austria. To the south was unfriendly Roumania.[1] Over this land the Germans crossed and recrossed from the west, the Russians from the east, and the Austrians from the south. Though all the people of the region suffered the ravages of war, Jewry suffered most. The contending armies found it necessary to court the good will of the Poles, the Ruthenians, and other peoples. The Jews, however, were friendless. Unlike the Belgians who had the allies to aid them the Jews were shut off from the world.

When the war came it appeared as though Russia would end her hostile attitude toward the Jew. In August of 1914 a manifesto was reported as having been issued by the Russian Czar to "my beloved Jews,"

[1] American Jewish Committee, *The Jews in the Eastern War Zone*, pp. 89. N. Y., 1916.

in Russian and in Yiddish, calling upon them to volunteer in the army. In the same month the Cabinet decided to allow Jewish families living outside the Pale to remain there if heads of those families had been called to the front. The Russian Cabinet also decided that Jews expelled from Germany and now living in Petrograd might remain there for two months. Men who had formerly been outspoken anti-Semites now declared that they were no longer hostile to the Jews.[2] But it soon developed that Russia was merely currying the favor of the Jews.

When the war broke out the political status of the Poles changed. Both the Russian and German armies sought their aid. Many of the Poles seized the opportunity to gratify personal animosity by denouncing the Jews as spies and traitors, now to one invader and now to the other. Aside from the Polish spy stories and libels, the military of both armies eagerly seized the stories of the Poles and blamed their defeats on the Jews.

As the war went on, the political changes that were made, further affected the Jews. German political intrigue played no small role in the increasingly difficult Jewish situation.

Though the Poles hated the Germans, their allegiance wavered between them and the Russians, to whom they were not much less antipathetic. As the Russian armies gave way to the German armies, Polish feeling went to the Germans, due for the most part, to Galicia's

[2] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1915, 1916, pp. 257ff.

allegiance to Austria. However, when the Poles noted that Germany was the dominant figure in the Austrian Reichrath, they became distrustful of her. When Germany began to aid Lithuania and the Ukraine, the Poles were ready to break with her. The final proof that Germany was working against Polish interests came when, at the treaty of Brest—Litovsk, Germany required the Soviet government to cede Poland and Courland to the central powers, to recognize Finland, Esthonia and Latvia, to give up the Ukraine, and to pay a contribution of 300,000,000 rubles. Poland now realized that her dream of freedom was remote. A result of this was the withdrawal of troops, by General Haller, to Bessarabia, where they were disarmed and routed by the German and Bolshevik armies.

Through this whole period the Poles generally favored the Russians, due to ties of race and religion. Iaconsky, the Polish patriot, said: "The Polish nation is torn into three parts, its sons in mutually hostile camps. In spite of that our feelings of sympathy for the Slavs weld us into one whole . . . Gold help the Slavs led by Russia to repulse the Teutons . . . Let us hope that the blood shed by us and the terrors of a fratricidal war may lead to the reunion of the three fragments of the Polish people."[3]

As Germany proved herself hostile to Polish aims, everything that smacked of Germany was attacked. Yiddish, which is perhaps 95 per cent German, was proscribed. The Poles and Russians, because of the

[3] *Encyc. Brit.*, p. 316. Vol. XXXII.

Ukrainian and Lithuanian policies of Germany, combined in an effort to exterminate the Jews, who were considered pro-German. Cause for persecution on the part of the Ukraine and Poland was due to the fact that Bolshevik Russia endeavored to spread her influence over them. Among the leaders of the Soviet government were many Jews. The Ukrainians accused the Jews of being pro-Polish. The Poles accused them of being pro-Ukraine and both accused the Jews of being Bolshevik. This is particularly true of the Ukraine, where many Jews became political leaders and officials of Ukraine villages. In short, the Jews, who it must not be forgotten constituted a large minority in these new states, were accused by each people of being pro-enemy.

Later, in revolutionary Russia, a liberal attitude was taken toward the Jew. Everything that savored of old Russia was discarded, among which were the various Jewish restrictions and disabilities. However, the Black Hundreds and other anti-Jewish organizations continued to spread propaganda against the Jews.

The Jews suffered similarly in other war stricken areas. A more intensive study of the problem in the various countries is necessary to better show the nationalistic character of the anti-Semitism in those countries.

RUSSIA

We have noted that the Russian policy toward the Jew had changed for the better at the very beginning

of the war. Evidence clearly indicates that such generous policy was in reality only a temporary expedient, dictated by military necessity and the need of a foreign loan.

Evidence in support of this view may be seen in the following instances:

The Minutes of the Council of Ministers for August, 4, 1915, at which session the abolition of the Pale was decreed, admitted that the measure was dictated by military necessity. It reads:

> "It has been observed, of late, in connection with the military situation, that Jews are emigrating en masse from the theatre of war and are gathering in certain interior governments of the Empire. This is explained, on the one hand, by the endeavor on the part of the Jewish population, to depart in good time from the localities threatened by the enemy, and on the other hand, by the order issued by our military authorities, to clear certain localities in the line of the enemy's advance. The further concentration of these refugees, whose number has been growing even greater, in the limited area now available to them, is causing unrest among the local native population and may lead to alarming consequences in the form of wholesale disorders. This excessive accumulation of Jewish refugees also impedes the government seriously in its efforts to provide food, work, and medical attention for them. Under these circumstances, deeming it urgently necessary to take prompt measures to avert undesirable pos-

sibilities, the Acting Minister of the Interior has made a representation with respect to this matter before the Council of Ministers.

"Taking up this immediate subject for deliberation and without touching upon the question of the general revision of laws now in force concerning Jews, the Council of Ministers has found that the most advisable way out of the situation created would be to grant the Jews the right of residence in cities and towns beyond the Pale of settlement. This privilege, established because of the exigencies of the military situation, must not, however, affect the capital cities (Petrograd and Moscow), and the localities under the jurisdiction of the Ministers of the Imperial Court and the Minister of War."[4]

As was shown by Duma Deputy Skobelev, "the question of the Pale was brought up in the Council of Ministers only when the wave of Jewish refugees had already swept away this medieval dam."[5]

That the decree was issued in the hope of facilitating a foreign loan is seen in the statement of Count A. Babrinski, a conservative member of the Imperial Council:

"The conservative members of the Imperial Council raised no objection whatsoever against the recent Government measure granting permission to the Jews to reside outside of the Pale. I believe that we shall have to become accustomed to the idea of seeing the Jews

[4] A. J. C,. *op. cit.*, 22.
[5] *Ibid*, p. 23.

dwell in all parts of Russia after this war is over. There can be no return to the old conditions. . . .

"The necessities of the war must lead us also to sanction future concessions toward the Jews whenever the need thereof will be recognized by the Government in order to be able to place a Government loan in America."[6]

Kalokal, the organ of the Holy Synod, was still more frank:

". . . If Germany excels us in armament and was better prepared in every other way it is because her nation is older than ours, older in its culture by several hundred years. Herein lies our weakness. But the Jews are the oldest people on earth. Their cult is the cult of gold and brains. . . . This people has learned to draw to itself the gold of the world. . . . Under the conditions of the present war the Jews are a power not to reckon with which is to be politically blind. Would it not be advantageous to Russia to throw into its scales these nuggets of gold, these billions of the international bankers?"[7]

These statements were ridiculed by the liberal press, led by the Petrograd *Retch,* which commented that, "It is difficult for the anti-Semites of yesterday to pour new wine into old flasks. The scarecrows of 'Jewish Free Masonry,' the 'universal Kehillah' and other myths still terrify the editors of 'Kolokal', but instead of screaming, 'The Jews are strong; crush them!' it

[6] *Ibid,* p. 24, quoted from the *Reform Advocate,* Nov. 13, 1915.
[7] *Ibid,* p. 24, quoted from *Retch,* Aug. 9 (22), 1915.

does not seem to occur to these new converts that the Jewish question is merely one of elementary civic decency."[8]

Aside from the abolition of the Pale as a necessity, commercial and other restrictions upon the Jews were lifted for the same reasons, generally.[9] On September 17, 1915, Prof. Ozerov and M. Protopopov pointed out the advantages of a commercial and financial understanding with America and to that end urged a revision of anti-Jewish laws.[10]

In practice the abolition decree and other rights were often ignored or evaded by local officials. The Governor of Smolensk continued to expel Jews. The government of Kiev refused to permit the publication of the ministerial decree until some six weeks after its promulgation. Jews continued to be expelled from the Caucasus, Tomsk, Siberia, and many other cities and provinces.[11] Jews were not allowed to buy, sell, rent, or lease land or real estate outside the Pale. The artisans privileged to practice their handicraft outside the Pale were not allowed to own their own homes. Occupational and educational restrictions continued as before.

Persecutions were also continued. Seizing upon the Polish stories, the Russian military authorities made the Jews scapegoats for their own failures and gave the stories wide circulation. In the official daily news-

[8] *Ibid,* p. 25.
[9] *A. J. Y. B.,* 1915, 1916, pp. 64ff.
[10] *Ibid,* p. 166.
[11] A. J. C., *op. cit.,* p. 26, quoted from Evreyskaya Zhizn, Oct. 25 (November 1), 1915, November 8 (21), 1915, etc.

paper issued by the Russian Government, the *Pravitelstvenny Viestnik,* May 6 (19), 1915, ran an account of the Kuzhi incident and an accusation against the Jews as traitors and spies. This story was investigated by the Jewish Deputy Friedman and the non-Jewish Deputy Kerensky. Kerensky denounced the whole story in the following words:

"I declare now from this rostrum that I personally went to the town of Kuzhi to verify the accusation that the Jewish people of Kuzhi had committed a treacherous assault on the Russian army, and I feel it my duty to reiterate that this is but an ingnominious slander. There was no such case, and under local conditions there could be none."[12]

The Shavli and other cases of slander are too numerous to mention here.

Military orders accusing the Jews of treachery and ordering the military authorities to take precautions and watch the Jews were common.[13]

Due to the similarity of the Yiddish and German languages, the Jews were laid open to further distrust. The use of the language was forbidden in conversation and correspondence.

In July, 1915, the commander of the Russian forces issued the following order:

> "On the basis of the power entrusted to me according to Paragraph 6, Article 415, Section 6, I prohibit postal and telegraph communications within the district occupied by the army entrusted

[12] *Ibid,* p. 49.
[13] *Ibid,* pp. 53ff.

to me, in the Jewish, German, and Hungarian languages."[14]

In a speech delivered in the Duma the non-Jewish deputy, Dzubinsky, testified as to the harrowing experiences, that the Jews were subjected to in various places. In the treatment of the Jews no distinction as to age, sex, or physical condition was made. Women in labor were given no consideration. Old men and women, children, the sick from the hospitals, the insane—all were driven *en masse* from one place to another.

Protests had to arise. Voices could not be stilled forever. Municipal bodies, trade and professional organizations, writers, and others threw caution to the winds and petitioned the government to suspend the policy of extermination.

In a session of the Duma the following questions regarding the Jews were referred to the "Committee on Interpellations" on August 30, 1915:

I. "Do the president of the Council of Ministers and Ministers of Interior and Justice know of illegal conduct of their administration officers with respect to the following:

That officers of the prison administration received persons taken by the military authorities as hostages from the local Jewish population of Riga, Prushkov. . .etc?

That the prosecuting attorneys took no steps

[14] *Ibid*, p. 62, quoted from *Evreyskaya Zhizn*, Aug. 9, 1915, pp. 19, 21.

to obtain the immediate release of these persons, accused of no crime and illegally imprisoned?

That the expelled were driven by agents of the police in Vilikomir, Zhagory, and Shadov into freight cars inadequate for accommodation of one-tenth of them, and that the remainder, including children, aged men and women and invalids, were compelled to follow afoot. . .?

II. If the illegal acts of the authorities are known to the indicated individuals, what steps were taken by them towards the punishment of the guilty and the prevention of similar breaches of law in the future?[15]

The above questions are enough to bear out the statement that the Jews suffered at the hands of both the populace and the government. Speeches by some men in the Duma further bear this out.

Professor Miliukov, leader of the Constitutional Democrats, said on July 19, 1915 (August 1) that, "The strongest force in disruption of national unity was the government policy towards alien subjects. The foul play upon the obscure racial prejudices of masses, with the customary weapon of this kind of strife—anti-Semitism and the persecution of all dissenting nationalities or religions—has been exercised with unparalleled effrontery. Under the mask of military precaution, measures worse than credible are taken against crimes that are imaginary. . ."[16]

[15] *Ibid*, pp. 70ff, from stenographic reports of Proceedings of the Duma.

[16] *Ibid*, pp. 72, 73.

Deputy Tchkheidze said on August 3, 1915 (August 16):

"It is well known to you that the Government regime has been based on Jewish oppression and that at all critical moments it aimed its blows first of all at the Jews, because they were in the line of least resistance. . .

"A year ago the war began and at once accusations of treachery against the Jews were started by the Government. . . The guilty ones were not at all the Jews, as the whole country will confirm, but those who stuffed their pockets with the money which they made on Government orders for army supplies. The guilty ones were those who, with the aid of men like Myasoyodyeff, Grotgus, and other traitors betrayed Russia. . .

"In the name of what truth is the Kuzhi slander being published in the 'Provitelstvenny Viestnik'. . . .?

"What justice demands that a Jewish volunteer, who has several times been wounded, be expelled within 24 hours when he tries to find a place in Russia to recover from his wounds?"[17]

The Military-Industrial Committee, organized in May, 1915, met on August 25, 1915, and condemned the incompetence of the government. In his presidential address P. P. Riabushinski said, "This leadership of the country has been attempted by persons incapable of leadership, and it is now evident to every-

[17] *Ibid*, p. 73.

body that a new personnel is needed within the government. . .We know that after a while, with the war continuing in the same poor fashion as at present, the government will be ready to meet us half-way, but we also know by experience that it will then be too late and even the very best man called by the government will be unable to accomplish anything."[18] How well Riabushinski prophesied!

Another speaker, Prof. E. L. Zubashov, referring to the Jews, declared that: "The sons of the Jewish nation are now fighting side by side with the Russians for their country. Unfortunately this country has until now been only a stepmother to them. . ."[19] His proposal of a resolution favoring the abolition of the Pale was accepted. Many other organizations acted similarly.[20]

Publicists and writers joined in the protest. Orlov, the organizer of the "Fatherland Union," a group that had separated from the "Archangel Michael Union" which urged the necessity of favoring the Poles as against the Jews, advised the Premier on Jan. 14, 1916 not to create dissatisfaction among the Jews, but to gain their friendship for Russia, as their support was valuable.[21]

A manifesto issued at the beginning of the war by 225 of the leading publicists and writers of Russia, declared among other things: ". . .The sorely-tried

[18] *Ibid*, p. 78.
[19] *Ibid*, pp. 79, 80.
[20] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1916-1917, pp. 164ff.
[21] *Ibid*, p. 167.

Jewish nation which has given to the world such precious contributions. . .which has always shared the travails and trials of Russian life; which has been hurt so often by prejudice and insult; which more than once has proven its love for Russia, and its devotion to her cause, is now again exposed to unjust accusations and persecutions.

". . .Let us understand that the prosperity and power of Russia are inseparable from the well-being and the liberty of all the nationalities which constitute its vast Empire. Let us understand the truth, act according to our intelligence and our conscience, and we may be certain that the ultimate disappearance of persecutions against the Jews and their complete emancipation will form one of the conditions of a truly constructive imperial regime."[22]

Notwithstanding the various protests and the effect of the governmental policy upon the liberal-minded element, Russia continued her traditional policy in regard to the Jew.

Only the revolution relieved the pressure brought to bear upon the Jews. With the abdication on March 15, 1917, of Nicholas II in favour of his brother Michael, a complete dissolution of all fundamental Russian institutions and notions began. One of the first acts of the Soviet of Workmen was to issue an order to all army units, enjoining the formation of Soldiers' Committees to watch over the behaviour of officers, to take over arms, etc. The Duma was set

[22] A. J. C., *op. cit.*, pp. 82, 83.

aside by the appointment of the Provisional Government, whose power was later won by the Soviet workmen and soldiers. Such revolutionists as Kerensky, Minister of War and Marines in the Provisional government and later the head of the government, Chernov, Minister of Agriculture in the same government, Scobelev, Minister of Labour, and others assumed control of the government. The "Council of Workmen, Soldiers and Peasants" had at its head Cheidze, a Georgian Social Democrat, who hated everything that savoured of Russia. Also such revolutionary leaders as Lenin and Trotsky were coming into Russia to further tear down Russian Autocracy.

Under the complete dissolution of Russian institutions the Jews could not help but be benefited. Freedom of movement, of residence, of trade, was immediately accorded the Jews.

All restrictions that had weighed down the Jews were suddenly lifted. On August 10, 1917, the "Central Committee of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers," learning of the revival of anti-Semitic activity, despatched agents to counteract the agitation. At Tsaritsin the army prevented the Black Hundreds and the Cossacks from starting a massacre. The ringleaders were arrested. At many other cities and towns the army prevented pogroms and violations.[23]

In August, at Simferopal, a new anti-Jewish league under the name of the "Red Glove" incited the people to pogroms. The leaders were found to be ex-police

[23] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1918-1919, pp. 257ff.

officials of the old regime. The Ukraine separation movement, fostered by Germany, was utilized by Jew-baiters to stir up anti-Jewish feeling in the Ukraine.[24]

With the outbreak of the revolution the nationalistic elements of the Ukraine came to the fore. The Provisional Government tried to postpone the secession of these border states until the calling of the Constitutional Assembly. The ministers, Zeretelli and Tereschenko, came from Petrograd to Kiev to reconcile the Ukraine. They recognized the right of the Ukraine to considerable autonomy. The central Rada, which based its claims upon the majority of the Ukrainian village, the intelligentsia and the urban lower middle class, became the powerful political power, independent of the Russian Provisional Government. The working classes were not at one with the Rada because they saw in it mainly representatives of the middle peasants of the Ukrainian village. Among the working class were Russians, Poles, and Jews. The Jewish Labor Bund, which took the middle ground between the national movement and the Russian revolutionary democracy, was soon forced into opposition to the nationalistic central Rada. The Fourth Manifesto, which proclaimed the independence of the Ukraine, was recognized as having been influenced by German pressure upon Soviet Russia. The proletariat sensed a union with Germany, but fear of Bolshevism forced them into inactivity. However, the Jewish Labor Bund voted against the Manifesto. In the meantime Kiev was

[24] *Ibid*, p. 257.

attacked by the Bolsheviks. Though the Jews opposed the Bolsheviks they were held as pro-Bolshevik because of their action against the Fourth Manifesto. "The anti-Semitic agitation increased after the Ukraine was reconquered by the central Rada with the help of German bayonets. . .The Jews were made the scapegoat, on the ground that they had caused the occupation of the Ukraine by German troops and were in the service of the Bolshevist government.[25] At this time Petlura and his bands of Gaidamaks followed by German troops entered Kiev and inaugurated a series of pogroms, such as even Old Russia had never seen.

Soon after the revolution broke out in Germany, a revolt against German domination in the Ukraine took place. At the head of the movement was a Directory and later Petlura. The Directory negotiated with the Entente, which held fast to the principle of a "united and undivided Russia." When Petlura entered Kiev in December 1918, at the head of the Directory, the troops were unstable and divided, most of them being radical and the minority being in favor of a national military dictatorship. The leaders, who were reactionaries, were confronted with the problem of welding the mass of troops into a unit. The military leadership was held by Konovaletz. As a means of uniting the army he selected two Ukrainian Cossacks and certain bands, "held together by their common hatred of the Bolsheviks and the Jews."[26] Pogroms became especial-

[25] Heifetz, E., *Slaughter of the Jews in the Ukraine*, p. 17.
[26] Heifetz, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 23ff.

ly intensified when the Bolsheviks threatened the Ukraine and were driven out by Denikin.

The tragic story of the Jews in the Ukraine has been told by others. The pogroms in Ovruch, Potapovichi, Geshovo, Medzhibozh, Annapol, Berdichev, Zhitomir, and numerous other places have been recounted. The Petlura and Denikin regimes need no further accounts.[27] "All traces of the 'liberties' promised in the Kerensky period were definitely wiped out, among them the liberties granted to the Jews."[28] The Bolshevist government was held up as a "Jewish government." At the head of the department of propaganda stood the well known leader of the Black Hundred in the time of the Czar, Savenko.

Anti-Semitic propaganda was carried on in Soviet Russia, as in Czaristic Russia. Dr. Ruben Blank in a telegram to Lucien Wolf, of London, stated that "Extreme Russian reactionaries ally themselves with extreme revolutionaries, and Black Hundreds have entered into tacit coalition with the Lenin party. In the army the former agents and detectives of the political police carry on campaigns for defeat, and in the rear the former agents provocateurs prepare and direct endless trouble. In the press and proclamations they go so far as to throw upon the Jews entire responsibility for the war and for the obstacles in the way of peace with Germany."[29] In September, a number of ringleaders in a plot organized by the secret

[27] *Ibid,* pp. 141ff.
[28] *Ibid,* p. 104.
[29] *A. J. Y. B.,* 1918-1919, p. 257.

society "Holy Russia," were arrested in Petrograd. This society circulated a newspaper named *Groza,* mainly in the Roumanian war zone, which contained attacks on the Jews and the Allies, urged immediate peace, and declared the Jews responsible for the continuance of the war. A new reactionary organization, "For the Tsar and Holy Russia," was found conducting a campaign against the Jews.[30]

Yet, Jewry benefitted from the revolution. Although the anti-religious and anti-capitalistic programs of the government worked hardship on the Jews, they were allowed such freedom of movement as they had never before experienced in Russia. Now, as Russia is coming to the realization that her existence must be precarious unless based on a capitalistic system, middle class Jewry is being allowed greater freedom in manufacturing and commerce. In religion, Russia is abandoning coercive measures and promises complete liberty to all. On the whole, Russia promises to take her place beside Great Britain and the United States as a free and tolerant state.

Due to the economies practiced by the Government, the school system with Yiddish as the language of instruction underwent changes in 1923 and 1924. The number of schools opened was fewer than in the preceding year. However, the number of children registered was greater. In the Ukraine, a large number of Jewish children entered public school, and Jewish parents are beginning to recognize the value of that in-

[30] *Ibid,* pp. 257ff.

stitution and to seek admission for their children, at the expense of the Yiddish attendance.

On November 18, 1926, an article appeared in the *New York Times* stating the position of the Soviet government in a speech by President Kalinin before the conference of the "Jewish Colonization Committee" held in Moscow on November 17, 1926.

President Kalinin pledged the "wholehearted assistance of the Soviet Government to the Jewish land colonization scheme. . ." He began his speech by declaring that the country is a "union of free, brotherly peoples, each with its cultural, social, and political autonomy, living in its own fatherland." He insisted that the government favoured the formation of a Jewish national group to live autonomously, in various parts of the land, such as the Crimea and the Azov.

The article goes on to discuss the artificiality of the anti-Semitism still existing in Russia:

> "Extraordinary as it may sound, many people here—belonging it is true, to the former upper, a bourgeois class—declare that anti-Semitic sentiment is stronger to-day than ever before. They argue that in the old days the Russian people, as a mass, felt little hostility toward the Jews and that pogroms were almost wholly artificial and fomented by the Czarist police and what now might be called the "Fascist Black Hundred"—an organization for political purposes, to make Israel the scapegoat of all kinds of revolutionary activity and to distract public attention from re-

forms which the Czar's government declined to adopt.

This view has been taken even by a number of Communists; but the latter do not draw the conclusion which their adversaries now put forward, that to-day there is a general anti-Semitic feeling, due, first, to the echo of this old fictitious indentification of the Jews with revolution. . ., second, to jealousy against the small number of Jews who profited by the new economic policy, and, third, the misunderstanding created among the Russian peasant population by reports that Jewish settlers are receiving the best Russian land.

Unjust as these three points are, the fact remains that there is a considerable amount of anti-Semitic feeling at present in Russia. . . .

". . .it is only within the last six months that a new note of anti-Semitism began to rise among the peasant population in response to what was called the favoritism shown the Jews in the matter of land colonization."

In answer to a letter voicing this grievance, President Kalinin said:

". . .the land given to the Jews in the Crimea and other parts of South Russia was not only far smaller in comparison to the numbers of the population than that given to the Russians, but it was land which was not available for settlement without irrigation, which the Russians were unable to undertake, and which was cultivated by

the Jews, thanks to foreign assistance, thus depriving no one and increasing the productivity of the Soviet State.

Nevertheless, the sentiment persists to a certain extent despite the fact that the Agrogoint and other Jewish colonies have done their utmost to conciliate their Russian neighbors by putting at their disposal tractors, well-diggers, and technical instructors.

Indeed there is every ground for believing a report of the "Agrogoint" and the Soviet Jewish Committee that the Russian peasants neighboring their colonies are on the friendliest terms with them.

There remains a certain hostility in villages that do not profit by the close association and yet hear reports of the sudden progress and—comparatively—superior standard of living of the new Jewish peasant groups."

The article concludes with a reprint from *Isvestia* in which the poet Mayakofsky says:

"You see Jews doing a good business in Moscow and hear that they are getting the best land in the Crimea; but do you realize the horrors and misery they suffered—the whips of Cossacks, the Pole's bullets, the ravishment of partisan bodies? From what floods of tears, what bitter agony, they emerged to try to take a place on land when stark hunger cried, 'Land or Death.' Barren steppes and encampment huts, then furious, unremitting toil. Now you see them, like our peasants, win-

ning a way to prosperity by the sweat of their brow. Soon you will not know them from Russians in a State where there are no nations and no war."[31]

POLAND

When the armies of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia overran Poland, the Poles saw their chance for freedom and seized it. They had never ceased dreaming of a free Poland. When the World War started the Poles saw in it not only a chance to regain their land, but also an opportunity to avenge themselves on the Jews. We have pointed out that the Poles now seized the occasion to denounce the Jews. A few examples will emphasize this contention better.

One of the first towns in Russian Poland, Zamosti, was taken by the Austrians in September, 1914. They were soon driven out; and at once the Poles accused the Jews of aiding the Austrians. Five of the twelve Jews arrested had already been hanged, when a Russian priest took oath that the Jews were innocent and that the Poles themselves had supported the Austrians and that even a telephone connection with Lemberg could be found. At Lemberg, in September, 1914, the Poles accused the Jews of firing on Russian troops. An investigation proved the Jews arrested to be innocent. At Kieltse and Radom the Poles denounced

[31] Walter Duranty, *Soviet to Give Jews National Autonomy, N. Y. Times,* November 18, 1926.

the Jews as German sympathizers. Here the Jews were also found to be innocent.[32]

These are only a very few instances. In not a single known case were the charges justified. Some of the slanders were so obviously absurd that even some Poles took measures to stop them. An army officer, a Pole, reports:

> "Where our detachment was stationed, I found a group of soldiers surrounding a muzhik, who was telling them that the Jews had cut the telegraph wires. The soldiers were furious. . . . I approached the group and said to the muzhik: 'I am glad to see that your patriotic impulses urge you to expose these Jew traitors. You must take me to them at once. . . .'
>
> "The muzhik became confused at once. He stammered: 'I didn't say anything about them. I didn't see them myself. . .People say so. Everybody says so.'
>
> ". . .After more evasions, the muzhik broke down completely. . ."[33]

Even the priests of Plotsk, headed by Archbishop Kovalsky, interceded on behalf of the Jews with the Russian authorities.

The "True Russian" leader, Orloff, after a visit to Poland, declared: "I have seen nothing bad on the part of the Jews, although the Poles made up all sorts of accusations against them. But in these Polish reports

---

[32] *American Jewish Committee*, 1916, pp. 42ff.

[33] *Ibid*, p. 46. Reprint from Polish paper, *Novo Gazetae*, in *Rasviet*, Feb. 8 (21), 1915, p. 36.

you feel prejudice, vindictiveness, hatred, nothing else . . .The Jews are loyal and brave, and it is most inadvisable to pursue a policy which might convert six million subjects into enemies."[34]

We have already mentioned spy-stories, military orders, and protests in our discussion of Russia. A further discussion of these is unnecessary here. The situation of the Jew in the new Polish state is of interest here.

In November, 1918, the Germans left Poland. General Pilsudski became the chief of State, with a Socialist and peasant Government, headed by Moraczewski. Later Paderewski took Moraczewski's place and a new coalition government of conservative tendencies was formed.

Of about 28,000,000 people, 4,000,000 were Jews, 3,500,000 Ruthenians, 2,000,000 Luthuanians, 2,000,000 White Russians, and 1,000,000 Germans.[35] It can be seen from these figures that a complex situation existed in Poland when she obtained her freedom. We find here four national groups beside the Jews.

As early as July, 1915, when the representatives of various parties among the Poles and Jews met in Warsaw to consider Polish-Jewish relations, all except the Nationalists decided to issue a joint declaration in favor of peace between the two. Thus, even before Poland had become established, its most powerful party was

[34] *Ibid,* p. 47. Reprint from *Rasviet,* Apr. 26 (May 9), 1915, p. 24.

[35] Goodhart, Arthur L., *Poland and the Minority Races,* p. 183.

hostile to the Jews. From this time the Poles became increasingly hostile. The boycott was retained. Educational restrictions were created. Pogroms continued—in short, the situation was little better than during the Old Russian regime. By 1919 the situation became so acute that in June, M. Paderewski, President of the Council of Ministers of Poland, asked President Wilson to appoint an American commission to ascertain whether or not the reported excesses were true. At the same time Parliament confirmed the elections of all Jewish deputies with the exception of three. According to a confidential order, of which Deputy Prilutzki obtained a copy, the government decided to exclude all Jews from service on the recommendation of the Association of Post Office Employees. On the 20th of the month the *Aftonbladet* (Stockholm) reported that the Polish Secretary of War had ordered the expulsion of all Jewish officers and military officials from the Polish army. Deputies Hartglass and Dr. Thon submitted in the Polish Diet a motion concerning the pogrom at Czenstochow, stating that the pogrom was prepared at the instigation of the newspaper, *Goniec Czenstochowski and Kurjer Czenstochowski.* The Diet refused to insist that the government suppress the pogrom agitation but ordered an investigation of the events at Czenstochow. Even while the American commission was traveling through various towns, excesses took place. Aside from the continued plundering of shops during the stay of the commission in Poland, the Poles and some of their newspapers showed a hostile attitude toward the commission itself. They

resented their appearance and felt that they were there only for the Jews.[36]

The attitude of the Poles toward the Jews is seen in the following:[37]

> In June, M. Dasznski, Socialist leader, expressed the conviction that excesses against the Jews, instead of ending the disastrous economic situation in Poland, would increase the general distress.
>
> On July 4th, a Jewish deputation from Lemberg waited upon the Minister of Education, and informed him that a government order, to the effect that only students who had been enlisted in the Polish army should be admitted to the higher educational institutions, was so interpreted as to exclude practically all the Galician Jews, in view of the neutrality adopted by them during the struggle between the Ukrainian and Polish forces.
>
> At a session of the Diet, M. Korfanty charged Jewish Bolsheviki with responsibility for the murder of Poles in Russia. Deputy Weinziher retorted that the head of the Moscow Terror Committee was M. Dozerdinsky, a Pole.
>
> On the 27th, M. Paderewski, in presenting the Peace Treaty to the "Ratification Committee of the Diet," stated that while the treaty was not terrible, it was disagreeable, because it imposed upon an ancient state, which had always maintained traditions of freedom, certain rules as

[36] Goodhart, Arthur L., *op. cit.*, p. 42ff.
[37] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1920-1921, pp. 240ff.

though it were not in a condition to introduce these rules itself. Paderewski had particular reference to the rules touching the Jews.

While the Peace Treaty recognized the civil equality of all Russian inhabitants of Poland, the Poles imposed a fine upon a number of Russian Jews for having failed to register as aliens.

In December, Deputies Lutoslavsky and Nemoyevski attacked Jews in the course of a food debate, accusing them of dishonesty.

In January, 1920, Parliament passed the Sunday-closing Bill. In the same month the Polish Diet passed a law declaring as aliens all persons not registered in the "Permanent Books" of the provinces. One hundred thousand Jews were affected. The Jewish deputies protested that during the Russian rule the registration now demanded was valueless and that the Jews had no occasion to register, and also that the new law was a breach of the Peace Treaty.

In March, 1920 Jewish students were refused admittance into the University of Lemberg. At a cabinet meeting, the Minister of Finance introduced a law to prohibit the sale of land to foreigners without his consent. This law affected 100,000 Jews who had been declared foreigners by the passing of the Polish Nationality Law.

Some of the causes of the excesses are seen in the following:[38]

[38] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1920-1921, pp. 247ff.

In June, the Press Bureau of the General Staff of Haller's army published a report in the *Nowa Reforma,* of the 6th, declaring that Bolshevik German-Jewish action provoked the anti-Jewish riots in Cracow. In Poryck (Volhynia) a pogrom was organized by Polish troops after the Ukranian retreat.

In May, in a special cable to the *Christian Science Monitor* (Boston, Mass.), the Paris correspondent reported that the advance of the Polish-Ukranian Army against Soviet troops in the Ukraine was accompanied by atrocities inflicted on the Jewish population.

From the few foregoing facts may be gleaned the situation of the Jews in Poland. A few statements as to the truth and the real underlying causes follow:[39]

In June, 1919 the Polish General Staff published a pamphlet on Bolshevism and the Polish question, declaring that it was senseless to pretend that Bolshevism was the work of a group of Jews.

Michael Henry Dziewicki, of the Jagellonian University, in a letter dated June 10 and published in the *London Times,* under the title "The Jews in Poland: Reasons for their Unpopularity," admitted the outrages, which he claimed were the result of economic difficulties—not of religious intolerance, but of hunger.

In a book entitled The *Foundations of the Polish Constitution,* Professor Waker, author of the

[39] *A. J. Y. B.,* 1920-1921, pp. 254ff.

draft of the Polish constitution, accepted by the Government, stated that in the original draft there was a paragraph granting national autonomy to the Jews, but that for unknown reasons this paragraph was stricken out upon the promulgation of the Constitution.

Mayor Yarosz, of Drohobycz, on the occasion of a funeral of two soldiers, repudiated the report that Jews assisted the Ukrainian troops, declaring that the Jews protected Poles during the Ukrainian occupation of Galicia.

Large placards appeared in the streets of Warsaw appealing to workmen not to join the strike movement because it was a Jewish effort to introduce Bolshevik-Jewish rule into Poland, and to enslave all Christian Poles.

In June of 1920 Jewish deputies presented a memorandum to the Premier in which they charged the government with inciting to pogroms under the mask of counteracting anti-Jewish activity.

In August the authorities decided to sell at auction property belonging to the local Jewish community to cover a debt of 1,000,000 marks which the communities were said to have incurred, under the late Tsar's government.

Merchants of Cracow appealed to the city council in February, 1921 for protection against alleged Jewish monopoly of the city's business.

The Polish Diet adopted, at the second reading of the constitution, a clause which made only a

Roman Catholic eligible for the presidency, even though the Peace Treaty provided that a difference of religion, creed, or confession should not prejudice any Polish citizen in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as for instance admission to public employments, functions, and honors."

During the Russo-Polish war, Jews were accused of aiding the Russians.[40]

At a conference of the Polish Premier with representative Jews, the Jews demanded that the authorities cease issuing circulars in which the Jews were accused of Bolshevism and that the Press desist from carrying on anti-Semitic propaganda.

At Siedlece, Jews were accused of firing on Polish troops.

On the other hand the Commander of Polish troops at Brody issued a denial of the stories of Jewish-Bolshevik co-operation during the invasion. Also General Rozwadowsk, chief of the Polish general staff, ordered that measures be taken to prevent attacks on the Jews actuated by charges of Bolshevist leanings, because the Jewish population had fulfilled its duty in every way. At Plotsk, Gavrolin, and other places the authorities refuted charges that the Jews were disloyal during Bolshevist occupation.

In October, 1920, Jewish deputies made public

[40] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1921-1922, pp. 189ff.

two official secret orders issued by the Polish War Ministry on November 7 and December 17, 1919, that all Jewish and German officials be dismissed because they were acting against Polish interests.

In December, Jewish deputies interpellated the Ministry of the Interior regarding the anti-Semitic placard posted by the Rozvoi on Christmas night, and pointed out that the appeal deliberately incited the Polish population against the Jews.

The foregoing examples, stated for the purpose of showing the causes of the anti-Semitic feeling and also with the view of showing the truth of the accusations, are merely a few taken at random. Instances of pillarge, murder, rape, and inquisition abound in Polish history from 1915 on. Curtailment of education in many places, an increased boycott, expulsions from the army and public offices, restricted immigration of Jews from other countries have been the policy of Poland since she has obtained autonomy.

The third decade of the twentieth century opened with the Jews in practically the same position as before. The reports of the American and British Commissions showed that there existed distrust and antagonism between the Poles and the Jews.

In an exchange of correspondence between Prince Lubomirski, the Minister of Poland, and Mr. Louis Marshall, the President of the American Jewish Committee, Prince Lubomirski wrote under date of October 30, 1920:

". . . I think that fundamentally the root of

whatever trouble has occurred in Poland is economic. . ."[41]

At the close of a conference between Prince Lubomirski and a delegation of the Provisional Committee of the Jewish Congress the Prince stated:

> "I have endeavoured to make clear to the conference that for nearly two years, owing to the war with Soviet Russia, an abnormal state of affairs had obtained in Poland. . . Now that peace has come to Poland, my government, in accordance with its traditional good will towards its Jewish citizens, is sure to put forth every endeavor in order to prevent any excesses and indignities such as are inspired in largest part by the excitement incident to a state of war."[42]

However, according to an order by the Polish Minister of War against anti-Semitic excesses, the situation seems to have been aggravated. The Order stated:[43]

> "Anti-Jewish excesses still constantly occur on the railroads and in the railroad stations. They are becoming more violent. . .and show a lack of discipline and of the feeling of honor on the part of the Polish soldiers. . .
>
> Minister of War,
> Polexterne."

Since 1920 the government authorities have continued their propaganda against the Jews. Premier

---

[41] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1921-1922, p. 338.
[42] *Ibid*, pp. 340, 341.
[43] *Ibid*, pp. 343, 344.

Sikorsky, in 1922, in an address in the Sejm, in connection with the struggle of the Jewish deputies to have rights granted them by the constitution, charged that the Jews were not loyal citizens and that they were seeking privileges.

The Rozvoi's anti-Semitic agitation in the schools has continued. In connection with this agitation, the third year students at the government gymnasium at Lida attempted to manhandle the only Jewish student in the class.

In 1923, the Jewish Kola (club of Sejm deputies) had to interpellate the Minister of Education and the Minister of Religion concerning anti-Jewish agitation carried on by teachers in the schools, especially in the "School of Commerce" in Warsaw.

About the middle of November, at a mass meeting, students demanded the restriction of Jews in the universities. This was followed by an attack on them. Soon after, the University of Posen restricted the admission of Jews, and the director of the high school at Kattowitz (Silesia) expelled all the Jewish students without notice.

As late as 1923 a proposal for a percentage restriction of Jewish students was supported by the government but due to the protest from France the measure was not enacted.

Complaints of government discrimination against Jews in the civil service have been made, and synagogues and other institutional buildings were requisitioned.

The boycott ardently advocated in 1923 by Ro-

man Dmowski, Minister of Foreign Affairs, spread to other parts of Europe. During the year there was agitation for it in Latvia, Danzig, Austria, Bukowina, and in parts of Germany.

When will Jewry be free in Poland? Freedom is too much to hope for in the near future. Perhaps the far-off future will lessen the burden of Jewry there. Now Poland is protected by France. Poland is necessary in Europe. Her position between Germany and Russia seems necessary to the Allied powers. These powers cannot coerce Poland to abide by the Peace Treaty. They cannot force Poland to treat her minorities humanely. The economic question is too great for immediate settlement. Jewry cannot but fear the Christian Poles. Poland is too well reared in anti-Semitism to cast it aside rapidly. Indeed, Jewry has no very bright future in Poland.

OTHER CENTRAL EUROPEAN STATES

The situation in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, and other states has been similar to that in Poland.

The last half of 1917 and the first half of 1918[44] witnessed expulsions of Jews from all Central European States. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* reported preparations by anti-Semitic organizations for a strong anti-Jewish campaign after the war. The *Deutsch-*

[44] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1918-1919. "Germany," pp. 242ff. "Austria-Hungary," pp. 233ff.

volkische Blätter, official organ of the German anti-Semites, in April, 1918, stated that the time had arrived to declare war on Jews openly, because of their alleged opposition to German war aims.

In Austria-Hungary during the same period the government at Budapest decided to expel from the city all refugees from Galicia and Bukowina. In Cracow the entire Jewish quarter was wrecked during food riots. The *Odzydzenie Polski,* an anti-Semitic movement, demanded the destruction of Jewish power in Poland. The Polish press, however, accused the German government of disseminating antagonism between Poles and Jews, to secure the support of the latter for the project of separating the Ukraine from Russia.

At the beginning of July 1915, the Roumanian government issued an order expelling all Jews from the frontier to the interior of the country. Thousands of Jewish refugees who had fled before the Russian army which invaded Bukowina, had sought refuge in Roumania. These were brutally expelled back into the war area. The action of the Government, in expelling native Jews, caused some adverse comment in the press. *Vitorul,* the official organ of the party in power tried to meet the attacks, but the *Bucharest Adeverul* (*Truth*), among other independent newspapers, replied:

> "In answer to the attacks of the Government organ upon the 'irresponsible' newspapers, we are in a position to publish a list of the 'peaceful Jewish population' which has been the subject of

the most terrible persecutions by the authorities. We can give the names of the reserves, mobilized at the very moment, whose children have been driven from their homes. . .

"But it is not we who are irresponsible. It is the government that tries to mislead the public with ambiguous statements. It says that the order referred only to the brokers, who may commit dangerous acts. We know that the law punishes crimes and delinquencies which have been committed, but does not anticipate crimes that may be committed. . . .

"It is an absolute fact that not transient traders but people who are innocent, who are paying taxes in those localities, have been expelled."

The latter part of 1918 and the early part of 1919 continued as before.[45] In the budget debate in the Reichsrat in July, 1918, Jerzabet, a Christian Socialist deputy, appealed to the emperor to "preserve the Christian population from the grief of the Jews who rule the country." In Hungary, Jews were charged with profiteering. All of them, however, proved their innocence. Count Szechenyi, the prefect of the gendarmes, who arrested the Jews, stated that the action against them had been ordered by the highest authorities in his absence and also that he had resigned in protest. The boycott movement gained momentum in Hungary. At Czernowitz (Bukowina), the

[45] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1919-1920. "Austria-Hungary," pp. 208ff. "Czecho-Slovakia," pp. 240ff.

Roumanians began pogrom activity. In January, the Austrian People's Party called upon the public to protest against the formation of a Jewish Republic in Austria. Leaflets were distributed inciting anti-Jewish pogroms. A Socialist leader denounced the agitation, pointing out that the old regime and not the Jews had brought misery upon the country. In the same month the Hungarian government issued a decree expelling all aliens, including the Jews.

In Czecho-Slovakia, while excesses were carried on and accusations made, Thomas Masaryk, president of the Czecho-Slovak National Assembly assured the Jews recognition of civil, religious, and political rights.

In Germany the Prussian Minister of the Interior prohibited the entry of Jewish workmen from eastern Europe, on the pretext of the danger of spreading epidemics. The executive of the "German People's Party," a nationalist group, demanded that frontiers be closed to Jewish immigrants from newly-acquired eastern territories in Poland, Courland, and Lithuania. The *Deutsche Zeitung*, organ of the Pan-Germans, published an article by Freiherr von Gebstattel, leader of the league, in which the writer cast the blame for the "inner disintegration" of Germany upon the Jews. In November, the Pan-German press styled the peace overtures of the government as "Jewish Instigations", At Baden, in January, 1919, the "Christian People's Party" organized for the purpose of procuring the enactment of measures "safeguarding Germany from Jewish despotism, and to prevent Jews, who only seek

financial interest from controlling the country." The medical faculty of the Marburg University voted to exclude Jews from the hospitals. Some of the speakers expressed fear of the danger of the Jews becoming the ruling race in Germany and masters of the "Red" Government. The *Vorwarts,* Socialist organ, repudiated charges of the reactionary press that Jews were fostering the Bolshevik movement.

In Roumania, M. Cuza, an anti-Semitic deputy, opposed a bill for the naturalization of Jews in accordance with the term of the Treaty of Bucharest. Parliament passed the bill in August, 1918. Premier Marghiloman stated that there was no danger to Roumania in granting rights to Jews and assured the country that the central powers would not compel the Roumanian Government to naturalize the Jews. In November, at Bucharest, a committee of professors and savants, including a former Minister of Education, collected 200,000 leis to resume publication of the anti-Semitic organ, *Semanatorul.* Jew-baiting leaflets, known as *Duminica Paprulin,* urged the population to boycott and kill the Jews.

In the Ukraine, peasants, incited by agitators, accused the Jews of helping the Germans obtain grain from them. Forces of the Hetman of Ukraine, General Skoropodsky, robbed the Jews and extorted money from them.

The period from June, 1919 to May 31, 1920 did not bring relief to the Jews, but rather aggravated

their condition.[46] Europe found itself almost bankrupt. The war had sapped it of its strength. Commerce was at a standstill. New states had been formed. All were in confusion. Jewry, accused of various imagined wrongs during the many past centuries, could not expect relief in exhausted Europe of 1919 and 1920.

In Austria, the anti-Semitic Union meeting in Vienna urged the Jews to leave Austria. In September, 1919, the government ordered the expulsion of all who were not subjects of the Austrian republic, thus vitally affecting the Galician and Bukowinian Jews who had fled to Vienna in consequence of the Russian invasions of 1914-1917. In October the *Wiener Stimme* suggested that 500,000 Jews of Austria be held as hostages, to compel Jews of the world to come to the aid of Austria. In November, 1918 the German Nationalists and the Christian Socialists accused Jewish fugitives of renting shops in order to be exempt from expulsion. Herr Stoecker, Pan-German member of the National Assembly, introduced an amendment to an agrarian law to provide that only Austrians of German Aryan descent be allowed to acquire landed property. In February, 1919, the "German National Party," founded by Dr. Wutte, an anti-Semite, demanded union with Germany, recognized the moral strength of Christianity, and would "combat Jewish influence." In April, the Vienna University was closed until May

[46] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1920-1921. "Austria," pp. 169ff. "Germany," pp. 215ff. "Roumania," pp. 264ff. "Latvia and Esthonia," p. 269. "Lithuania," pp. 269ff. "Ukraine," pp. 277ff. "Greece," p. 337.

3, owing to anti-Semitic demonstrations by German Nationalist students, who drove the Jewish students from class rooms.

However, some men came to the aid of the Jews. In July, 1919, a manifesto signed by the leading Majority Socialists, including Ministers Müller and Wissel, described the anti-Jewish agitators as "Monarchical wire-pullers who stand in the background and supply the pogrom with money with both hands, wish to cover the revolution with shame at home as well as abroad, and resurrect on the ruins of a degraded republic the old monarchical regime." In September at a weekly meeting of the Pan-German League, Baron von Villinghoff stated: "We demand the union of German-Austria with Germany, and the abolition of the unbearable domination of the Jews."

In Roumania, Premier John C. Bratiano refused to sign the Treaty of St. Germain with Austria, containing stipulations which guaranteed the rights of racial, linguistic, and religious minorities in Austria and in regions formerly subject to Austria. At Bukowina, the population was incited to pogroms by pamphlets denouncing the Jews as Bolsheviks.

However, the condition of the Jews here was greatly improved in 1920. This improvement came as part of the program of an enlightened governmental policy following closely upon the territorial enlargement of Roumania. Discriminatory laws and regulations were abolished, in harmony with the terms of the treaty with the Allied and Associated Powers.

In Ukrainia, the efforts of the nationals to attain statehood resulted, as we have hereinbefore mentioned, in a strict anti-Jewish programme. The Ukraine continued its anti-Jewish policy to such an extent that Mr. Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States, promised to take under advisement the suggestion that the United States request Great Britain, France, and Italy to join with it in sending an international "Military Commission" to the Ukraine, to follow the various military movements there—thus affording opportunities to bring about a cessation of the atrocities.

In Greece, in December, 1919, an anti-Semitic plot was discovered in connection with the anti-Venizelos intrigue. Aside from a few instances of anti-Jewish feeling, Greece was very tolerant toward the Jews, recognizing religious, civil, and political rights.

The conditions of Hungary were worse than elsewhere. Outbreaks by the White Army resulted in the murder of many Jews and in the looting of their property. The Jews were libelled and made responsible for the actions of Bela Kun. Here increasing numbers of students were barred from schools. Various organizations were formed for the express purpose of ridding Hungary of the Jews, among them being the "Hakenkreuzler," which staged many anti-Jewish demonstrations in the country.

FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN, AND AMERICA

The Jews of France have been essentially city-dwellers. The great majority have lived in Paris, be-

longing to the middle class and devoting themselves to commerce, industry, and the liberal professions. Their attachment to France during the war was instinctive. During a national manifestation which took place at the Sorbonne, on March 7, 1917, in which all religious organizations took part, M. Sylvain Levi, professor at the College de France, said, in the name of French Jewry, "Israel has received from its prophets the unshakable faith in the triumph of justice. To-day, France, the emancipator nation, is once again the champion of righteousness. Her children of the Jewish faith will serve her without fail until the day of victory, which should give back to the French communities their old birthplace, Alsace-Lorraine." This is the spirit in which the Jews of France entered the war.[47] There were those who by force had been made German subjects in Alsace Lorraine, who came to France to serve under her flag. Among these was Georges Weil, deputy from Metz, Gabriel Meyer, who escaped from Saverne and came to die as a French soldier before Arras, and David Block, an aviator of Guebrviller, who was shot by a German firing squad for joining the French.

There are no figures available as to the exact number of Jews who fought under French colors, but examples of heroic service, of glorious death on the battle field are many.[48]

---

[47] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1919-1920, pp. 35ff.

[48] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1919-1920. "The Participation of the Jews of France in the Great War," pp. 31ff.

The story of British[49] and American[50] Jewry in the war is the same as that of French Jewry.

Yet, the years following the war have placed Jewry in a trying position in these free countries. The anti-Semitic movement in these countries has been distinctly economic and intellectual.

It does not matter that for each Trotsky, Kamenev, and Sverdlov, there are dozens of Vinzvers, Dans, Minors, Gotzes, and Sliosbergs; Jews have been accused of wishing to effect a general upheaval of society. Anti-Semitic writers do not speak of Jewish proscription, oppression, and confiscation at the hands of the Bolsheviks. Neither do they speak of the thousands of poverty stricken Jews when they accuse the Jewish millionaires of seeking to control the world. Neither do they mention the various occupational restrictions placed on the Jews of the various countries when they accuse them of performing only unproductive work, as if the middle class is unproductive. When they speak of the moneyed, so-called autocratic Jews, they fail to mention the Jewish radical socialists, and, vice-versa.

Unable to arouse the peoples of Western Europe and the United States by the old accusations which had always brought martyrdom to the Jews, the agitators attempted to satisfy the demand for a "Whipping Boy" by pointing to the Jews as the "cause of world unrest". Taking advantage of the passions and hatreds

[49] *Ibid*, "The Story of British Jewry in the War," pp. 99ff.
[50] *Ibid*, "American Jews in the World War," pp. 141ff.

aroused by the world war, which resulted in the abolition of privilege, the overthrow of thrones, and the dismemberment of empires, the agitators evolved an insane forgery and made it the foundation of their attack on the Jews.

The past two years have seen somewhat of a collapse of the agitation, due to the concerted efforts of the press, the church, and some well-known writers. Mention of these will be made later.

A concerted movement was conducted in Great Britain, France, and the United States, aside from the other countries of which we have spoken, to fasten upon the Jews, as a people, the odium of having brought about the world war. The sponsors of the movement based their attacks upon the alleged number of Jews in the government of Soviet Russia. They pretended that the Bolshevik revolution, which, as they said, was purely Jewish, was part of a plan arranged by an international group of Jews to acquire world domination. In their eagerness they seized upon the spurious articles entitled "The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion," first published in Russia in 1905 by one Nilus, whose very identity is a matter of mystery. This forgery was circulated and broadcasted by various secret methods. In Germany it was furthered by the Junkers under the leadership of Count Reventlow; in France by those prominent in the Dreyfus affair; in England by a circle that laments the passing of the Romanoffs; and in America by a group of Russians who were among the leaders of the Black Hundreds.

Authorities on Russian literature and history have shown that the "Protocols" are mere fabrications invented for the purpose of counter-revolutionary propaganda in Russia in 1905, and that they were employed by the officers of General Denikine to recruit volunteers, by stigmatizing the Bolshevist revolution as a purely Jewish program of securing world domination. Though the Protocols were thoroughly discredited, an edition appeared in America, followed by a series of articles in Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent.*

In England there appeared in the *London Morning Post* a series of anonymous articles in which the Jews were alleged to be united with the Free masons in a conspiracy against civilization. These articles were published in book form under the title *The Cause of World Unrest.*

The firm G. P. Putnam Sons, of New York and London, published an American edition of *The Cause of World Unrest,* with an introduction by H. A. Gwynne, the editor of the *London Morning Post.*

However, by 1921 the agitation was seen in its true light, and the libels were found to be spurious. Thousands of newspaper editorials denounced the agitation as dangerous to the development of American ideals.

The Church was not slow to follow the lead of the Press. On December 5, 1920 there was held at Boston, Massachusetts, the quadrennial convention of the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America," at which meeting, attended by delegates representing thirty denominations and 150,000 churches, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas, for some time past there have been in circulation in this country publications tending to create race prejudice and arouse animosity against our Jewish fellow-citizens and containing charges so preposterous as to be unworthy of credence, be it resolved that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. . .earnestly admonishes our people to express disapproval of all actions which are conducive or tend to the destruction of our national unity through arousing racial division in our body politic."[51]

On the 16th day of January, a protest, prepared under the initiative of John Spargo, signed by 119 distinguished American Christians, was made public:

The Peril of Racial Prejudice. A Statement to the Public.

"The undersigned citizens of Gentile birth and Christian faith view with profound regret and disapproval the appearance in this country of what is apparently an organized campaign of anti-Semitism, conducted in close conformity to and in co-operation with similar campaigns in Europe . . .

"These publications, to which wide circulation is being given, are thus introducing into our national political life a new and dangerous spirit, one that is wholly at variance with our traditions and ideals and subversive of our system of government. . .

[51] *A. J. Y. B.*, 1922-1923, pp. 331, 332.

> "Anti-Semitism is almost invariably associated with lawlessness and with brutality and injustice. It is also invariably found closely intertwined with other sinister forces, particularly those which are corrupt, reactionary, and oppressive. . .[52]

A number of publications written by scholars aided in bringing about the collapse of the agitation. Mr. Lucien Wolf published a number of articles in various British periodicals which traced the charge of a Jewish plot to overthrow civilization to a "German anti-Semitic and Anglophobe myth, founded in malice and hysteria, built up by garbled history, and synthesized by impudent forgery."[53]

In America, John Spargo published *The Jew and American Ideals,* analyzing the various accusations and making a plea to the American people "for America's safety and honor."[54]

Mr. Israel Zangwill, in an article entitled "The Legend of the Conquering Jew," analyzed the fear of modern Jew-baiters and proved beyond a doubt the utter falsity of their accusations.[55]

Mr. Herman Bernstein published *The History of a Lie,* disclosing Russian documents which demonstrate beyond a doubt that the author of the "Protocols" derived his inspiration from German anti-Semitic literature which had been translated into Russian, first in

---

[52] *Ibid,* pp. 332ff.
[53] *Ibid,* p. 338.
[54] *Ibid,* p. 339.
[55] *Ibid,* p. 339.

1871 and later in 1891, which was used by the Russian Czarist police to incite pogroms against the Jews.[56]

In Paris, M. A. du Chayla, a Frenchman by birth, who was a commander of Cossacks during the war, stated that he spent nine months during 1909 at the monastery where Sergei Nilus lived. According to him, the original manuscript of the "Protocols" was transmitted to Nilus by General Rachkovsky, one time head of the Russian political police in France, under whose inspiration the "document" was fabricated with a view to its use in inciting the Russian populace against the Jews at a time when revolution was threatening the Czar.

The *London Times,* which at first professed to see truth in the articles, later published a series of articles, contributed by its Constantinople correspondent, which demonstrated the "Protocols" to be a plagiarism from a French political pamphlet directed against Napoleon III and published in Brussels in 1865 by a French lawyer named Maurice Joly, entitled "Dialogues in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu."[57]

The above examples of the falsity of The Protocols and the account that the Jews were the cause of the misfortune of the world, are but further proof of thesis that Jew-hatred is fundamentally nationalistic, religion being the weapon with which states have sought to further their political theories and suppress whatever may offer real or supposed resistance to them.

---

[56] *Ibid,* pp. 339, 340.
[57] *Ibid,* pp. 341, 342.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The Jew is persecuted everywhere because he lives everywhere, and is everywhere a little different from other people. His religion is essentially the same as that of other peoples but his ritual is peculiar to himself. His tradition is as peculiar to himself as the tradition of any other people is peculiar to itself. Due to his existence in a diaspora, persecuted because of his peculiarities, his group mind is peculiar. He possesses the introspective, the analytical mind, the aggression, and the ability to suffer which come from such a solidarity as history has never before seen. Such solidarity has not been self-imposed but rather has been imposed by a non-understanding, dissimilar, non-Jewish group. His characteristics are based "on the nervous reactions which have resulted from more varieties and larger oppression than those of any other group. . .The most outstanding result of the oppression psychosis is to create a group solidarity which is far stronger than could have been created by any other means."[1] Such group solidarity has made the Jew a frontier group, a stranger in any group and yet known to every group. He is recognized by every people among whom he lives and yet is only known superfi-

[1] Miller, Dr. Herbert A., *Races, Nations and Classes,* pp. 35, 36.

cially by them. Being different and barely known the Jew cannot but be hated. Had the Jew been allowed to mingle freely with those people in whose lands he lived, he would have become part of them and would have lost his identity. Closer relationship with the non-Jewish group necessarily entails a diminishing relationship with the Jewish group. The farther the Jew is removed from his group the easier his adaptation to the new group. In the second, third, or fourth generation his adaptation to the new group must make of him a different group-individual. Of course the ease and speed with which he adapts himself to the new group depends greatly upon the cordiality and grace with which the group accepts him. Assuming that he is accepted and adapted, he becomes as much a "flag-waver" as the other members. His individualistic mind becomes merged in the mind of the group.

The Jew, however, has never been accepted. He has thus never wholly adapted himself. So long as he is considered a stranger he holds on to membership in his own group. He has come into contact with the non-Jewish group but he has been thrown back upon himself. As a result he retains those characteristics which are peculiarly Jewish. "Membership in the Jewish group establishes in the members a set of habits which are the personal counterpart of the customs of the group. . ."[2]

When the Jews possessed a state of their own they possessed a group-mind, a consciousness, the purpose

[2] Hart, Joseph K., *The Survey*, March 15, 1924.

of which was to perpetuate the state in a manner peculiar to themselves. Necessarily, the imposition of the Jewish consciousness upon the neighboring states was the means of perpetuation. Babylonian, Greek, and Roman consciousness also necessitated imposition. In short, the problem of kingdoms then, as today, was to impose or be imposed upon.

As the Jews took up residence in the Greek world, nationalism, or the imposition of Greek consciousness, or group mind, remained a cause of conflict. Though the early Greek City-States harboured little or no religious antipathy towards the Jews, the Jews possessed such racial and traditional peculiarities as necessitated conflict. The foreign customs, ideas and institutions of the Jews were as patent to the Greek conquerors as were those of the Poles to Bismarck in the nineteenth century. It was not a question of obliterating a religious or linguistic or cultural peculiarity but a question of obliterating the sum total; a question of doing away, by one means ar another, with a group which, by virtue of its existence in the body of the whole, constituted a menace in some degree to that whole.

In the early Roman world the identical condition existed. It must not be forgotten that the downfall of the Jewish state was not far removed from the existence of the Jews in the Greek and Roman worlds. Peoples are not assimilated wholly in a short time. The assimilation of the Jews into the Greek world entailed the assimilation of Jewish consciousness into Greek consciousness. Before this was under way the Roman

conqueror came. He had the problem of assimilating into the Roman body a combination of Greek and Jew. Nevertheless, in line with the Roman policy of tolerance, this would have been successfully brought about had it not been for the appearance of a new group.

The new group, as has been said, created a problem, the solution to which could only be found in persecution. The Jews now suffered with the Christians. As Christianity gained in power and finally succeeded Rome as the ruling power of Europe, the Jews came into conflict with a force which has never relinquished its hold on human thought.

Religion, as had been said, was never the fundamental cause of anti-Semitism. Christianity and Judaism are not dissimilar, essentially. However, the organization of each is dissimilar. The outward manifestations of each are dissimilar. Each has its peculiar ritual and organization. Each is a living institution unto itself, and as such is outside of law. Each group thinks that it is the one proper human group, necessary to bring about that which is fundamentally the same in both. As a consequence of this human attitude, the Jews, living in the Holy Roman Church-State, could not but constitute a frontier group and as such be hated.

As the church reached its greatest heights, temporal ambitions so invaded it that a questioning attitude arose in various parts of its lands. The Renaissance, or "rebirth of classical antiquity," and tem-

poral ambitions on the part of the various princes of Europe aided the impending break from the church. The rebirth of commerce and the interchange of ideas and learning also hastened the Reformation. Though the Reformation merely accentuated the division of Europe into a number of political-religious states and thus did not decrease the persecution of the Jews, it gave impetus to a wider learning, and hence greater understanding of the Jews. By virtue of the existence of a number of strong states, each competing with the others, commercially conscious groups arose which afforded a closer relationship between peoples. Learning, which formerly subsisted in the hands of the church, was now more widely desseminated . The times of "Humanism" were at hand. The separation of church and state was imminent. The Christian scholars learned Hebrew from Jews whom their medieval predecessors would have avoided. The political philosophers sought to separate the church from the state. Religious belief was not something to be imposed upon the individual. The Jews might exist in a state predominantly Christian. A new respect, born of a greater knowledge, was felt for the Jews. They became less of a frontier group. Humanism, the Libertarian movement, the "Aufklärung" paved the way to the French revolution. The Jews were admitted to French citizenship. We have here the results of internationalism, of the effect of a wider group synthesis upon the Jewish problem.

With the downfall of Napoleon and the subsequent reversion to national consciousness we note a reversion

to an intense anti-Semitism. The Jews are yet a strange group. Their oppression psychosis has made them strangers. They are separatists, the extent of which tendency is based upon the amount of tolerance accorded them and their removal from the areas of greatest oppression. The German and Russian political philosophies, born of the peculiar group minds and needs of those countries, cannot conceive of a state of which Jews can form a part. The presence of so divergent a group as the Jews is inimical to the solidarity necessary to the imposition of the will of the state upon other states. Nationalism is impossible with an international Jewish group existing in the body of the state.

It is nothing that Jews are financially self-sustaining, that Jews are morally the equal of their neighbors, that Jews have produced scholars, artists, and statesmen. It does not matter that Jews are practically unknown in Italy and in the Scandinavian peninsula because of their assimilation with the peoples there. Nor does it make any difference that Jews become as much English or American as non-Jews do. The Jews nevertheless are persecuted by nationals who seek a group solidarity of those within the borders and those irridentists outside. The problem is the elimination of sub-groups and of sub-group minds. The idea of a large group composed of small groups is unintelligible to nationals.

It is not for us to forecast the history of the Jews. Yet, we cannot see any relief in sight for the Jews or any other minority people with the existence of a

great number of boundaries, each endeavoring to inclose a number of individuals alike in manners, customs, ideas, traditions, and appearance. The greater the number of groups the greater must be the number of group-minds. It necessarily follows that the more widespread must become the policy of "imposition," of "nationalism."

A world-wide group-mind is impossible. Society is too complex and covers a world composed of too great a variety of natural conditions to hope for a world-wide group-mind. The only hope for tolerance, if not for unqualified freedom of thought and act, is in such a realignment of political groups as will create a few states of equal importance and strength and the inclusion of the various smaller groups in the particular large states to which they possess most kinship. Whether such groups can be based on culture, geography, race, or language does not concern us here, nor are we competent to pass judgment. However, a realignment that will place small states which are ever seeking growth at the expense of each other, under the control of a few equally important states, will do much to eliminate distrust and group ego, which is in the final analysis the cause of the "imposition" or "Nationalism" of groups.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Abbott, George Frederick, *Israel in Europe.* New York, The Macmillan Co. 1907.

American Jewish Year Book. Philadelphia, Pa. Jewish Publication Society of America.

Bates, Jean Victor. *Our Allies and Enemies in the Near-East.* Chapman. 1918.

Bentwich, Norman DeMattos. *Hellenism.* Philadelphia, Pa. Jewish Publication Society of America. 1919.

Bernstein, Herman. *History of a Lie.* Ogilvie Pub. Co. 1921.

Cohen, Israel. *Jewish Life in Modern Times.* Dodd, Mead and Co. 1914.

Dubnow, Semion Markovich. *History of the Jews.* Philadelphia, Pa. American Jewish Publication Society. 1903.

Dearborn Independent. *The International Jew.* Dearborn Publishing Co.

Edersheim, Alfred. *The Temple; its Ministry and Services as they were at the time of Jesus Christ.* Hodder. 1910.

Fishberg, Maurice. "The Jews: a Study of Race and Environment." *Contemporary Science Series.* Scott. 1911.

Goodman, Paul. *History of the Jews.* Dent. 1911.

Geiger, Abraham. *Judaism and its History.* Thalmessinger. 1865.

Graetz, Heinrich. *History of the Jews.* Jewish Historical Society. 6 Vols. 1891-1898.

Grant, Elihu. *The Orient in Bible Times.* New York. Lippincott. 1920.

Goodhard, Arthur. *Poland and the Minority Races.* Brentano. 1920.

Hard, William. *The Great Jewish Conspiracy.* American Jewish Book Co. 1920.

Heifetz, Elias. *Slaughter of Jews in the Ukraine in* 1919. Seltzer. 1921.

Hendrick, Burton Jesse. *The Jews in America.* Doubleday. 1923.

Hermalin, D. M. "Roumanian Jews in America." *American Jewish Year Book,* 1901. American Jewish Publication Society.

Hess, Moses. *Rome and Jerusalem.* New York, Bloch Publishing Co. 1918.

Hurt, Walter. *The Truth About the Jews.* Horton. 1922.

Hyamson, Albert M. *Palestine; The Rebirth of an Ancient People.* Knopf, 1919; *History of the Jews in England.* Outlook. 1908.

Jacobs, Joseph. *Jewish Contributions to Civilization.* Conat Press. 1919.

Josephus, Flavius. *Works of Josephus.* Armstrong, 1888.

Jews in the Eastern War Zone. New York. American Jewish Committee Publication. 1916.

Jewish Historical Society of England. Vols. 1-10. Jewish Historical Society of England Publications. London.

Jewish Quarterly Review. October, 1899—July, 1890; October, 1891—July, 1892; October, 1897—July, 1908; July, 1910. American Jewish Book Co.

Kent, Charles Foster. *History of the Hebrew People.* 1897.

Levinger, Lee, Rabbi. *Anti-Semitism in America.* Ph.D. Theses of the University of Pa. Bloch Publishing Co. 1925. New York.

Leroy-Beaulieu, Anatole. *Israel Among the Nations.* 1896.

Joseph, Samuel. "Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881 to 1910." *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Vol. 59. Columbia University, New York. 1914.

Jastrow, Morris. *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions.* Scribner. 1914.

Karpeles, Gustav. *A Sketch of Jewish History.* Jewish Publication Society of America. 1897.

Kayserling, Meyer. *Christopher Columbus and the Participation of the Jews in the Spanish and Portuguese Discoveries.* Longmans. 1907.

Kohler, Max James, and Wolf, Simon. "Jewish Disabilities in the Balkan States." *American Jewish Historical Society Publications No.* 24. 1916.

Krauskopf, Joseph. *Prejudice.* New York. Bloch Publishing Co. 1909.

Lazare, Bernard. *Anti-Semitism.* 1903.

Lewishohn, Ludwig. *Israel.* Liveright. 1925.

McCall, Samuel Walker. *Patriotism and the American Jew.* Plymouth Press. 1924.

Morais, Henry Samuel. *Eminent Israelites of the 19th Century.* Stern, 1880.

Manning, Henry E., Cardinal. "Persecution of the Jews." *Modern Eloquence.* Vol. 9.

Macaulay. Thomas Babington, Lord. "Civil Disabilities of the Jews." *Edinburgh Review, Critical and Historical Essays,* Vol. 1. Putnam, 1903.

National Polish Committee of America. *The Jews in Poland; Official Reports of the American and British Investigating Missions.* 1920.

Newman, Lewis Israel. *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements.* Columbia University Press. 1925.

Nordau, Max, and Gottheil, Gustav. "Zionism and Anti-Semitism." *Contemporary Thought Series.* 1904.

Petrie, William Matthew Flinders. *Status of the Jews in Egypt.* Allen. 1922.

Peel, Sir Robert. "The Disabilities of the Jews." *Modern Eloquence.* Vol. 14.

Peters, Madison Clinton. *Justice to the Jew.* Trow Press. 1910.

Philipson, David. *The Reform Movement in Judaism.* New York. Macmillan. 1907.

Radin, Max. *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans.* Philadelphia, Pa. Jewish Publication Society. 1915.

Raisin, Max. *History of the Jews in Modern Times.* New York. Hebrew Publishing Co. 1919.

Rohold, S. B. *The War and the Jew.* Standard Publication Co. 1917.

Renan, Ernest. *History of the People of Israel.* 5 Vols. Roberts, 1894-95.

Ruppin, Arthur. *The Jews of Today.*

Ridgley, Frank Harris. *Jewish Ethical Idealism.* Gorham Press. 1918.

Ravage, Marcus Eli. *The Jew Pays.* New York. Knopf. 1919.

Raisin, Jacob Spinoza. *The Haskala Movement in Russia.* Jewish Publication Society of America. 1913.

Samuel, Maurice. *You Gentiles.* Harcourt. 1924.

Spargo, John. *The Jew and American Ideals.* Harper. 1921.

Schwarzfeld, E. "Jews in Roumania." *American Jewish Year Book,* Vol. 13. 1901.

Sabatini, Rafael. *Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition.* Houghton. 1924.

Smith, Henry Preserved. *Religion of Israel.* New York. Scribner. 1914.

Sombart, Werner. *The Jews and Modern Capitalism.* New York. 1913.

Urrusov, Serfiei Dmitrievich, Prince. *Memoirs of a Russian Governor.* New York. Harper. 1909.

Wiernik, Peter. *History of the Jews in America from the Period of the Discovery of the New World to the Present Time.* Jewish Press Publication Co. 1912.

Zangwill, Israel. *The War for the World.* New York. Macmillan. 1916. *Chosen Peoples.* Allen. 1918. *The Voice of Jerusalem.* Macmillan. 1921.

APPENDIX II

Anonymous. *The Pan-German Doctrine.* New York. Harper and Bros. 1904.

Bernhardi, Friedrich von. *Germany and the Next War.* Arnold. 1914.

Boas, Franz. *Mind of Primitive Man.* New York. Macmillan. 1911.

Bryce, James. *International Relations.* New York. Macmillan. 1922. *Essays and Addresses in War Time.* Macmillan. 1918.

Bury, John Bognell. *History of Freedom of Thought.* Holt. 1913.

Dawson, William Harbutt. *Bismarck and State Socialism.* Social Science Series. 1891.

Dewey, John. *German Philosophy and Politics.* Holt. 1915.

Dunning, W. A. *Political Theories.* 3 Vols. New York. Macmillan. 1920.

Duranty, Walter. "Soviet to Give Jews National Autonomy." *New York Times.* November 18, 1926.

Executive Document No. 470, *Congressional Record.* Vol. 13, part 7, Appendix.

Franke, Kuno. *Social Forces in German Literature.* Nation. 1896.

Fuller, Joseph V. *Bismarck's Diplomacy at its Zenith.* Harvard University Press. 1922.

Gibbons, Herbert A. *Reconstruction of Poland and the Near East.* New York. Century. 1917.

Gooch, George Peabody. *Germany,* Scribner, 1915; *Germany and the French Revolution,* Longmans, 1920; *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century,* Scribner. 1924; *Nationalism,* Swarthmore.

Hart, Joseph K. *The Survey.* March 15, 1924.

Harden, Maximillian. *Monarchs and Men.* Nash. 1912.

Headlam, James Wycliffe. "Treitschke," *Encyclopedia Britannica,* XXVII, p. 238.

Kornilov, Alex. *Modern Russian History,* 2 vols. New York. Knopf. 1916-17.

Kropotkin, Prince A. *History of Ethics.* MacVeagh. 1924.

Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue. *Spirit of Russia.* 2 vols. Alden. 1919.

Miller, Dr. Herbert A. *Races, Nations and Classes.* Lippincott. 1924.

Moore, George Foote. *History of Religions.* 2 vols. New York. Scribner. 1913-19.

Philips, Charles. *The New Poland.*

Randall, J. H. *The Making of the Modern Mind.*

Russian Revolutionary Government. *Secret Documents.* Vol. VI.

Sarolea, Charles. *Letters on Polish Affairs.* Oliver. 1922. *German Principles and Personalities.* Chatto. 1917.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich Ernst Daniel. *On Religion.* Paul. 1893.

Vinogradoff, Sir Paul. "Russia." *Encyclopedia Britannica,* Vol. XXXXII, p. 309ff. *Reconstruction of Russia.* Oxford University Press. 1919.

White, Andrew Dickson. *Seven Great Statesmen.* Century. 1910.

Whitman, Sidney. *Teuton Studies.* 1895.

Witte, Serge Iulievich. *Memoirs of Count Witte.* Doubleday. 1921.